

J. W. Elliston

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. VIII.

NOVEMBER, 1831.

NO. 6.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND OF THE CHURCHES IN HOLLAND.

CONTENTS.

	<i>page.</i>		<i>page.</i>
Remarks on a sermon delivered at Morristown, N. J. Feb. 1829, by the Rev. Albert Barnes,	321	Josephus,	355
Review of an article styled "the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel," published in March last,	328	France—Continental Society,	365
Charge to the Rev. James McCarrell, by the Rev. David Blair,	337	Heresey Spreading,	368
Do thy self no harm,	346	Popish Indulgence,	372
On the divinity of Christ,	348	Abstinence,	374
The history of the New Testament, confirmed and illustrated by passages from		Queries,	378
		Christ the Son of God,	378
		Biblical Criticism,	
		Mark ix. 49,	379
		Isaiah xxxiv. 7,	380
		Matthew iii. 4.	383
		God save the King,	384

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls. JER vi. 16.

EDITED BY A MINISTER OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

ALBANY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY B. D. PACKARD & CO. NO. 71 STATE-STREET;
Two sheets—octavo.

1911

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
 AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. VIII.

NOVEMBER, 1831.

NO. 6.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

REMARKS ON A SERMON DELIVERED AT MORRISTOWN, N. J. FEB. 1829, BY THE REV. ALBERT BARNES, ENTITLED, "THE WAY OF SALVATION."

The circumstances in which the author of the above mentioned discourse was placed, have brought it into notice, and occasioned an extensive discussion of its doctrines. Shortly after its appearance, a well written review of it was published in the *Philadelphian*, which was followed by a number of articles, some in defence of the sermon, and others in defence of the review. It is probable, however, that many readers of the *Monitor* have never seen either the sermon or the review. An examination of the sermon may therefore, not only be interesting to such, on account of the controversy which it has occasioned, but, as the plan is general, and the author has managed to introduce into it most of those doctrines which are commonly designated as Hopkinsian or New-School divinity, it may serve to show what this new divinity is, from what other systems it is borrowed, and to what other systems it naturally tends. One chief design of the review published in the *Philadelphian*, was to show the opposition of the doctrines of the sermon to those of the Confession of Faith, the acknowledged creed of the author. It is not designed to travel over this ground again, because it has been preoccupied with such advantage, that we believe no candid person will be found bold enough to dispute the positions of the reviewer. The chief design of this communication is to examine the doctrines of the sermon, in order that it may be seen what those "unguarded and objectionable passages" are, which were noticed more generally in a communication from one of the correspondents of the *Monitor*, published last July. In doing so, we shall not aim, at any other order than that which is observ-

ed in the sermon; but for the sake of distinctness, shall introduce the notice of different things by distinct captions. Beginning then with the advertisement, we notice first,

A new rule for judging of the truth, and a wonderful discovery made by this rule. The new rule for judging of the truth is the success of the preacher, and the discovery is, that truth is not hurtful to religion. The discourse was prepared and delivered in the midst of a very extensive revival. The author considered this time of excitement favourable for fixing in the mind permanent impressions of revealed truth, and accordingly preached this sermon designing it as a comprehensive view of the Christian system; and he considers that the delivery of the discourse has established this point: "*That injury is not done in a revival by a full exhibition of God's plan of saving men, according to his sovereign will and pleasure.*" How are we to understand this language? Is it not here insinuated that it has been hitherto a doubtful matter whether a faithful exhibition of the truth was favorable or hurtful to the progress of religion, and that a great increase of light is attained when it is established, that the preaching of the truth is not positively injurious. We had always supposed it a settled point, that the truth was the only means for promoting a true revival; but among other modern discoveries, it may be that there is a religion discovered, of which it is saying a great deal, when we can say, the truth does not check or destroy it. And by what means was this discovery made, and how were the doctrines taught, established as true doctrines? It is plainly insinuated that the good effects resulting from the exhibition of these doctrines proved them to be true as well as harmless. If so, then a new rule is set up, and instead of going to the law and testimony to learn what we are to believe, we must consider

what doctrines are taught by those who succeed best in promoting revivals. If we do not altogether mistake the meaning of the author, he considers that the doctrines of God's sovereignty, man's obligation, &c. were established by the success which attended the exhibition of them. It was established that these doctrines were true, and that the preaching of these truths did not injure revivals. Now if we should apply this rule in all cases, to what opposite and absurd conclusions would it not lead us? Christ taught the truth as never man taught it, and yet we read of no revivals under his ministry. Others drew a multitude of disciples after them by teaching things which they ought not. We beg leave therefore to adhere to the old Protestant doctrine, that the Bible is the only perfect rule of faith and practice; and cannot believe that the success of a preacher establishes his doctrines; or that his want of success, refutes them. This statement would have been past over as merely unguarded language, were it not that the opinions suggested by it are common, and have a ruinous tendency to turn away the minds of men from the study of the Bible, and to set them afloat before every wind of doctrine. Though we cannot fully discuss the subject, we cannot wholly omit noticing, in the next place,

The influence of false doctrine in promoting spurious revivals. There is no good work of the Spirit which has not its counterfeit; and there is, therefore, good reason for examining every spirit, that we may be on our guard against deception. The author of the sermon considers certain truths established by the delivery of it. We should suppose if any thing were established, it was that revivals were best promoted, when the leading doctrines of the Bible were kept out of view, and much of the truth corrupted;—when sinners were neither made acquainted with what they are, nor what they must become, nor by what means this change is to be effected. We honestly think that such as are saved, according to the way of salvation taught in the sermon, are saved to their hurt, that their wounds have neither been fairly opened, nor soundly healed. We cannot help adding that in many instances both the measures and doctrines by which revivals are promoted have too much the character of human invention. Where do we find in the scriptures, a four days' meeting prescribed as a means of grace? Is there any charm in the number *four* beyond any other number, that it should be so regularly adopted, that the term has become familiarly understood as denoting the prelude to

a revival? Has the Spirit so given up his freedom that he will blow when and where we list? Or is there any promise on which faith may rest that a four days' meeting will bring his influence? Where has the scriptures classed men as we often find them classed, some serious, some anxious, some hopeful? Where has it warranted us to denominate all those who make profession, pious, and to distinguish others as sinners? Where has it by precept, promise or example, required or encouraged anxious or whispering meetings? Where has it authorised men to set up an anxious seat, a place more holy, a part of God's house where prayer will be more effectual, and the blessing commanded in greater abundance? Where has it authorized calling men to rise up and to lift up the hand in testimony of their desire to get religion, or of their acceptance of Christ? It may be that in some of these things we are under mistake, not having been witnesses of such proceedings; but enough may be gathered from the published reports of these things, to show that there is in them much of human device; nor was it at all strange, as stated in some late publications, that our brethren in Europe did not for a long time understand our American revivals. They had the word of God giving a full account of all the means of grace, a full account of all the operations of the Spirit, but our language was strange to their ears. What! the language of the Spirit strange to those having the self same Spirit? Must there not be some delusion where believers do not understand each other's language? Where the work of God in one place is unintelligible to his people in another? And as human ingenuity is resorted to for measures, rather than the word of God, is there not reason to apprehend that the same corrupt source is resorted to for doctrines? Any one who will compare the sermon under consideration with the word of God, may easily see a wide departure both from the doctrines and the style of the scriptures. It is on the same subject with the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. Like them it professes to teach "the leading doctrines of the Bible respecting God's way of saving men." Yet we have looked in vain to find an account of the sinner in his natural state being *under the law*, or of his being *delivered from the law*; we find nothing said of *Christ being made under the law to redeem us from the law*, or of his *redeeming us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*; we find nothing about our ruin by the covenant of works, or our recovery by the covenant of

grace,—nothing of the necessity of union to Christ, that we *may bring forth fruit unto God*—we find nothing about the believer's desire to be *found in Christ, not having on his own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ*—nothing about our being *justified by faith*, and *justified truly by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus*. There may be some resemblance of these doctrines in parts of the discourse, but they are not fairly brought forth, and discussed as they were by the Apostles. They are not made as they should be, the leading doctrines of the Bible on this subject. Nor does the apology of the author for omitting some of these points appear sufficient. He has stated that they were not matters of dispute where he preached. Is he a master in Israel, and ignorant that these doctrines are violently opposed by every corrupt heart? There is such blindness of mind and enmity of heart, to the way of justification through faith in Christ, that these doctrines ought rather to be inculcated every day, than omitted in a sermon professedly embracing, not merely the truth on disputed points, but the leading doctrines of the Bible on the way of salvation. But leaving this matter on which it was not intended to have said so much, the next thing we shall notice is,

The doctrine of disinterested benevolence. “The obligation of the sinner,” it is said, “is not measured by the favours he hopes to obtain.” If it had been said, his obligation is not founded on the hope of favours, or limited by such a hope, the expression would have been unexceptionable; but it is probable the meaning of the author will not be misrepresented by supposing him to have had the doctrine of disinterested benevolence in his eye; that is, that we are bound to love God for what he is, and without a respect to our own interest; that so far as we are influenced by the hope of favour, we are guilty of selfishness. We are confirmed in this view of the above expression, by finding that selfishness is so often mentioned as the prominent trait of the natural character, while the unqualified love of God is urged as our duty, and regeneration is said to be, “not merely a love of happiness in a new form, but a love of God and divine things, because they are good and amiable in themselves.” We do not think that the obligation of the sinner is measured exclusively by the hope of favour, but neither do we think that this hope hath no part in its measurement. This hope greatly increases our obligation, so that as we ought to render

to God according to benefits conferred, we ought also to live according to our expectations—to be supported, and animated, and purified by the hope set before us. This disinterested benevolence, as the term is generally understood, seems quite opposite to the whole tenor of the scriptures. They are continually addressing themselves to our hopes and fears, and engaging us to the Lord by a regard to our own interests. And if this regard to our own interests be confounded with selfishness, as the same thing, we must accuse the scriptures as favoring selfishness, and condemn the most eminent saints for having respect to the recompense of reward. Nor would Christ or God escape our censure. Christ looked to the joy set before him, and God hath made all things for himself. Yet Christ is our example in looking to this joy, and God is blessed of his saints, because he hath made all things, and because for his pleasure they are and were created. Selfishness does not consist in regarding our own interest, but in regarding it exclusively, in being swallowed up in our own concerns, to the entire neglect of others. He is not selfish who looks with interest on his own things while he also looks to the things of others, but he who cares for nothing but himself. If this plain distinction were kept in view, the mists about obligation and motives which envelope the minds of some would be dissipated. Men sometimes speculate in theories till they travel quite out of the region of facts and possibilities. And of this we have additional proof in the next and last doctrine which we shall at present notice, which is,

A willingness to be damned, substituted in the room of faith in Jesus Christ.—The great thing inculcated upon inquiring sinners by the Apostles was faith in Jesus Christ. “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” The great thing inculcated by the author of this sermon, according to his own statement, was; “The duty of an immediate and unqualified surrender into God’s hands,” and under the power of these exhortations “the convicted sinner, says he has felt the necessity of casting himself on the mercy of God to be saved or lost at his will.” If a willingness to be damned is our duty, then some of the other doctrines of the sermon will be found correct, so far as they relate to this matter; for men are not only naturally able but naturally inclined to submit to damnation. It is the chief prayer and the great effort of their lives to secure it; they call down wrath, they treasure up wrath, they love death and hate

their own mercies. But the object of the gospel and gospel ministry is not to persuade us to submit to wrath, but to flee from it.—God is revealed not as reconciling us to damnation, but to himself. The Spirit makes a willing people, willing to come to God, not to depart from him. He enables us to embrace the promises and to lay hold of the hope set before us. And the highest evidence of his work on the soul is in a cordial belief in Christ, not for wrath but for salvation. *We believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved.* The idea of casting one's self on the mercy of God to be saved or lost,—of deriving damnation from the mercy of God,—of taking hold of the covenant of peace to be destroyed with an everlasting destruction, is so utterly at war with scripture and reason, and every thing plausible or possible, that hardly any thing but the publication of such a sentiment, would convince us that any maintained it. Yet this is an opinion avowed by many, who profess to be extending the reformation begun by our Fathers, and who suppose that at this late hour they have discovered the true gospel about which men have hitherto been much in the dark. When we consider how many have espoused such a sentiment as this, and are seriously urging as the highest evidence of a gracious state, what is in reality, the prevailing character of wicked men, we cannot help exclaiming, Lord what is man!—What is there that this poor, depraved, deluded being, may not be tempted to believe and do? What is it to be damned? Is it not to be separated from God forever,—to have the heart forever filled with the blackest hatred, and the mouth forever filled with cursing and blasphemy? And are ministers called to urge submission to such a state as this? It is true, believers ought to own that they deserve damnation, but they should do every thing rather than submit to it. To the sufferings of this life they have submitted, because they were light and momentary:—this is the utmost extent to which Paul professes submission, and to this he was encouraged by the hope of an eternal weight of glory. But the notion of submitting to a dreadful and eternal weight of wrath, without one ray of hope to cheer us, is neither found in the Bible nor in the bosom of the believer. This is sometimes defended as the only unqualified and perfect submission.—But no submission can be so perfect or acceptable to God as that which he has required in his word. Those who like the Pharisees seek to go beyond the law, transgress it.

In this instance, while aiming to extend the spirit of Christianity beyond the law, they return back to the first principles of sin, and inculcate the very essence of all wickedness as the highest attainment of faith,—a willingness to be separated from God as the best evidence of our love. Nor can this opinion be regarded as a harmless speculation. It enters deeply into the very vitals of religion. If it be, as we are persuaded it is, a false opinion, every man who adopts it must either be the victim of despair, or of delusion. He must find himself unwilling to be damned, and therefore despair of being saved; or he must deceive himself by a belief that the Spirit has wrought in him a disposition which the Spirit works in no one.

[To be continued.]

[For the Religious Monitor.]

REVIEW OF AN ARTICLE STYLED "THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL," PUBLISHED IN MARCH LAST.

MR. EDITOR.—In the March No. of your useful Miscellany, there is an article on "The Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel," signed by "Antipas." As a Calvinist and Presbyterian, I regret that when you selected it you did not see proper to accompany it with some remarks. But it is probable that the article has struck me in a different manner from what it did you. My first impressions of its character and tendency were far from being favorable; and a more careful and patient investigation of its contents, particularly of its phraseology, has forced more strongly upon me the conviction,—that a person may subscribe it, and yet hold all the leading doctrines of the Hopkinsian school—that the writer is a disciple of that school,—and that its tendency is inimical to the calvinistic views of those important doctrines, which it seems to support, while it ambiguously and covertly fosters the spirit and essence of Hopkinsianism.

The article immediately going before, is a "letter on the introduction and progress of Unitarianism in N. England;" professing to show that "the growth and prevalence of this heresy were greatly promoted by concealment." The author has shown with ability, and no doubt with as much truth, how successfully this *old*, (I may add this *first*) and long practised engine of Satan has been used to advance the cause of Anti-trinitarianism in New England. Yet after a careful perusal of all his letters, as far as they have been re-published in the Monitor, I am persuaded, that the cause of truth demands the judgment to be formed and proclaimed pub-

licly, that "Investigator," in assigning the causes of "the introduction and progress of Unitarianism in New England," has been practising to some extent, the same mischievous art. If, as he says, "the poison is in this way taken without alarm, and the infection spread through the religious community, before apprehension is excited, or the friends of truth apprized of their danger;" can any one doubt that "the growth and prevalence" of Hopkinsianism has eminently aided the cause of Unitarianism, who has candidly observed the *secret* and *sinuous* progress of Hopkinsianism throughout the United States, in the Congregational churches, the general Assembly of the Presbyterian church, the Reformed Dutch Church, and others; and who candidly contemplates its licentious and alarming but *insidious* influence at present in those churches under the name of "Orthodoxy" and "Evangelical Religion"? And yet, "Investigator" has not noticed the tendency and effect of this system, as a pioneer to Unitarianism in the land of the pilgrims. The reason is, if I mistake not, that he and his brother Antipas, instead of acting as their names seem to promise, are, in common with a host of others, unconsciously laboring in the same unholy work. It is fairly inferrible from their silence concerning the Hopkinsian heresy, that they are independents in church government and Hopkinsians in doctrine. The grounds of this judgment concerning "Antipas" shall be given more at large by and by. In application to both, I shall here take the liberty of transcribing an extract from Dr. Mather's "Prognostications upon the future state of New England," quoted by "Investigator," in a note to his third letter. It is as follows:—"There was a town called Amyclae, which was ruined by *silence*. The rulers, because there had been some false alarms, forbade all people, under pain of death, to speak of any enemies approaching them. So when the enemies came indeed, no man durst speak of it, and the town was lost. Corruptions will grow upon this land, and they will gain *by silence*. It will be so invidious to speak of them, that no man will dare to do it, and the fate of Amyclae will come upon the land."

But it is particularly to the article on "the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel" that I would direct the attention of the reader. And these strictures on the letters of "Investigator," are introduced only to show, as I wish to do in some further remarks, that *concealment* is not peculiar to Unitarians, but is the art, in the practice of which, Hopkinsians

have been and are, at this moment, equally famous and successful. Yea, in some districts, at least, on a fair comparison of the claims of these two classes of Theologians to this kind of management and trick, I am persuaded, that the Hopkinsian will be entitled to the palm.

If we are set for the defence of "the principles of the Reformation," that is, of the Bible, "as set forth in the formularies of the Westminster Divines and of the churches of Holland," we ought, especially if officially stationed on the walls of Zion, at this dark and perilous hour, to endeavor to detect all concealed and secret movements of the enemies of truth, tear from them the specious mask in which they may be shrouded, expose them in their true form and lift the warning voice.

It is not, I think, presumptuous to aver, that the writer of "Fundamental Doctrines" is a Hopkinsian; and if so, he is pretty well disciplined in the "cunning craftiness" of the school. I am aware, that some may choose to consider this a mistake, as it is very common for many to disclaim the name Hopkinsian, who, at the same time, hold all the leading doctrines of the system, that is now generally distinguished by that name. Still his piece bears prominently on its face the character of *ambiguity*, so that with a little of that *pious facility*, so fashionable at present, two persons of very opposite sentiments may subscribe it, and thus the real lover of calvinism be deceived by it. It is not that "*sound speech* which cannot be condemned."

Are these "perilous times" of "the last days"? Are they marked by all the nineteen tokens in Paul's prediction to Timothy, 2d Epistle, iii. 1—5? Are they distinguished by "divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine of Christ; effected by good words and fair speeches" that "deceive the hearts of the simple"? Are "many false prophets gone out into the world, who creep into houses" and churches, "unawares"? Who "resist the truth," and "privily bring in damnable heresies"? Who traffick in "feigned words"? Who "come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves"? Who "corrupt the word of God"? Who "walk in craftiness and handle the word of God deceitfully"? Who "depart from the faith, and speak lies in hypocrisy"? In such times, and with such signs every where surrounding us, this is *not* the style in which to speak of "Fundamental Doctrines." It is *not* the language that befits the presently suffering cause of truth. It is *not* the clear

and certain sound that arouses to arms,—that marshals for the battle. It is *not* the wakeful sentinel's voice, who is fain to direct to all the points of attack. It is *not* the language of the witness, sworn to declare "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." If it has point sufficiently keen to goad the Arminian and others of "them that dwell on the earth," it does *not* "torment" or annoy the Hopkinsian antichrist.

Having noticed what the article is *not*, we may now proceed to show more particularly what it is:—that it contains internal evidence that its author is a friend to the peculiarities of Hopkinsianism. Those, acquainted with the dialect and mode of controversy, used by this class of theologians, will easily perceive, from the general expression of the piece, that many of the most monstrous of Hopkinsian absurdities may be couched under the phraseology of 'Antipas,' especially as they are celebrated for what they call 'proper explanation of their sentiments and meaning,' by which, in certain circumstances, and for certain ends, they will insist that the difference lies only in words, and then again, by the same convenient method, they would persuade, that the old fashioned doctrines of Calvinism, and of the Westminster confession of Faith, are 'dangerous delusions.*' But as many of your readers may be only partially aware of this 'sleight' of tongue, and 'cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive,' I shall point to a few prominent sentences in 'Antipas.' 'The depravity of sinners consists principally in selfishness.' It is true that here the word '*principally*,' qualifies *selfishness*. But even this, in connexion with the other parts of the piece, can only be viewed as an abatement of expression, concerning their doctrine, that 'all sin consists in selfishness, and allholiness in God or man, in disinterested benevolence.' Again he says, 'let a Unitarian, or any other errorist, or any impenitent sinner, see himself in the light of God's holiness and sovereignty; and

he can find no light, nor peace, nor hope, until by submission to the justice of God in his own condemnation and punishment, he asks and receives his pardoning mercy through the name and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.' This sentence is susceptible of an entirely sound meaning, and some may wonder why it is produced as evidence of 'Antipas' Hopkinsianism. But the reader who is acquainted with their modes of expression will perceive how easily it admits of being embodied in a scheme to profess, or rather to *conceal* an opposite sentiment. Hence the Hopkinsian, with all his peculiar notions about a willingness to be damned for the glory of God, as a prerequisite qualification to the reception of pardoning mercy, can subscribe it. But let us take another sentence of 'Antipas,' as a clearer interpreter of his meaning in the phrase 'submission to the justice of God, &c.' and then compare them both with some extracts from Hopkinsian authors. He says, 'The controversy between the friends and foes of God and his truth, turns upon the real character and true glory of God; and it is not settled in respect to any person, until he turns from himself, in view of his sinfulness and dependance, and unto God in view of his holiness and sovereignty, and *submits himself with holy repentance* to his holy and sovereign pleasure.' This sentence is worthy of particular notice, as explanatory of the former. It is not the dialect used in any school of genuine Calvinism. The peculiarity of expression in the words, '*submits himself with holy repentance, &c.*' ascertains it to be one of the shibboleths of Hopkinsians. Compare it with the style and sentiment of the following, 'All penitent sinners must be willing to suffer the wrath and curse of God forever, on supposition that it were necessary for the glory of God and the public good.' 'The gospel is not a mere declaration of pardoning mercy to sinners, without any condition to be performed on their part;—the condition is faith on Christ, including love to God, returning to him, *submitting to his sovereignty, before they know whether he intends to save or destroy them.*' 'Sinners must first love God,—their being worthy of God's love depends on their loving him.' 'Conversion consists in reconciliation to a holy, sovereign, sin-revenging God.' 'Every sinner, in order to be saved, must love a holy, sin-hating, sin-revenging God, while he has no evidence of any interest in his special favor.' 'That men cannot love God, before they believe that he loves them, and intends to save them, is totally selfish.'

* Mr. Barnes' claim to the right of "the proper explanation of his sentiments and meaning," is only a small specimen of their method. Thus Dr. Ely, the maker of "Contrasts," and a number of others, his Pseudo-Calvinist brethren, are convinced that the doctrines of Mr. B.'s "sermon on the way of salvation" can be reconciled with sound doctrine. And thus a number even of those of more principle in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church are gulled into the belief that Hopkinsianism is a system of only "venial errors." The deadly stab inflicted on the cause of truth by the late decision of the General Assembly, in the case of Mr. B., with a long list of other acts of the same character, is awfully illustrative of this position.

‘It is impossible for sinners to receive divine mercy before they are willing to sink as low as divine justice can sink them.’ “Not from love to pain, but to benevolent justice, penitent sinners are willing to give up their own personal good, if the glory of God, which is a greater good, require it.” “We should desire that God should carry into execution his plans, whether to raise or sink, save or destroy us forever.” “When the sinner first loves God, without knowing whether he will grant or deny his request for mercy, he is willing that God should do his pleasure and glorify himself by him, either as a vessel of mercy, or a vessel of wrath.” “It is as consistent with the moral rectitude of the Deity to produce sinful as holy exercises, in the minds of men.” “It is not implied in true repentance, but is inconsistent with it, to be sorry that any evil action took place, because God ordained it for his glory, and his agency was engaged in producing it.” These extracts show what Hopkinsians mean by “God’s holy and sovereign pleasure,”—by “holy repentance”—and by the sinners “submission to God’s holy and sovereign pleasure,” or his “submission to the justice of God in his own condemnation and punishment.” By a little examination the reader will see how easy such blasphemous absurdities may be concealed under Antipas’ phraseology, and then let him judge how far they are exegetical of Antipas’ meaning. Though they may not in every respect furnish a correct commentary on Antipas’ opinions; yet I do aver that his phraseology is better modeled to express such sentiments than to delineate the Bible doctrine on these points. But in farther confirmation of this, let us take his next sentence, which runs thus, “In the exercise of such repentance, no person can find, or make any difficulty, that can prevent the exercise of faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.” My first remark on this, is, that it teaches the exercise of holy repentance before the exercise of justifying faith. But I would remark farther, that as it is plain from the foregoing that he makes “holy repentance” to consist in ‘submission to God’s holy and sovereign pleasure,’ so he makes such repentance an exercise toward a sovereign and absolute God, and a condition of asking and receiving his pardoning mercy through the name and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Let it be here kept in view that the Hopkinsian teaches the precedence of repentance to faith—that repentance consists in love of God as a holy sin-hating and sin revenging God,

without any “apprehension of his mercy in Christ.” To teach the view of faith and repentance as laid down in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, is by his decision “totally selfish.” It is offering no violence either to this sentence, or the article on fundamental doctrines, taken as a whole, to explain it in consistency with Hopkinsianism, to which it bears such a marked and strong affinity. And then it has no kindred with the Calvinistic System as exhibited in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms; the Hopkinsian System would explain it thus, “In the exercise of such repentance, wherein the sinner first loves God, without knowing whether he will grant or deny his request for mercy,” wherein “he is willing that God should do his pleasure, and glorify himself by him, either as a vessel of mercy, or a vessel of wrath,” “no person can find or make any difficulty, to prevent the exercise of faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ.” Another sentence of Antipas runs thus, “In connexion with the doctrines of election and reprobation, the doctrine of total depravity in its root and branches, or its blossoms and fruits; the doctrine of justification by faith alone, through the atonement of Jesus Christ,” &c. The Hopkinsian professes to hold the doctrine of total depravity, and yet denies that its root consists in the guilt of Adam’s first sin imputed to his posterity,—denies that this depravation of nature is universal—denies that it affects man’s natural powers, and maintains that “it is as consistent with the moral rectitude of the Deity to produce sinful as holy exercises in the minds of men:” that our connection with Adam is only by a constitution in which, as a consequence of Adam’s sin, God determined to bring us into the world sinners, or determined to cause our first volition, or moral exercise to be sinful; that not till such exercise is a personal act, is any of Adam’s seed condemned: that we have as much natural ability to begin and to continue to love God as to continue to hate him—that we have as much natural power to love God and do any spiritual act as we have to think, speak, walk, or perform any natural action; that the sinner “has natural power to frustrate the decrees of God,”* and the saint “natural ability to fall from grace.” On this sentence

* The reader will perceive that according to the Hopkinsian divinity natural ability to love God or to frustrate his decrees, is predicable of the Devils, in a sense as much superior to the sense in which it is predicable of men, as the Devils are superior to men in physical and intellectual powers.

of Antipas I would ask farther, would any lover of the doctrine of imputed righteousness, when writing on fundamental doctrines, and especially when undertaking to warn against the Arminian and Unitarian leaven, call it "the doctrine of justification by faith alone through the atonement of Jesus Christ?" This is one of the notable methods in which these self styled opponents of Arminianism and Unitarianism wrap up and *conceal* their real and inveterate enmity to the vicarious sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, and justification by his righteousness *imputed* to the sinner, and received by faith alone. I shall point but to one more sentence of Antipas, it is this, "In vain do they, who profess to be orthodox, attempt to overcome and remove Unitarianism and Universalism, Infidelity and Atheism from New England, while they harbor the mother of these pernicious delusions." This makes it plain that the author does not desire "to overcome and remove" Hopkinsianism from New-England as a "pernicious delusion"—that he considers it no "enemy to God and his truth," or if so, that it is so perfectly innocent and harmless that an intercourse may safely be kept up with it to multiply its progeny.

The scope of this article of Antipas professes to represent the holiness and sovereignty of God on the one hand, and the sinfulness and dependence of man on the other, as the fundamental doctrines of the gospel,—to show that the source of all error lies in opposition to these,—that the controversy between the friends and the foes of God and his truth does not turn upon the difference between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism,—that Arminianism is the mother of Unitarianism, and all other erroneous opinions on religious subjects,—and that it is vain and hopeless to oppose Unitarianism while Arminians are countenanced. No doubt these doctrines, that is as the scripture exhibits them, lie at the foundation of the gospel, and are "main pillars in the system of religion taught in the Bible." No doubt God's controversy on earth does not lie only between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism. No doubt the system of Arminianism is at eternal and irreconcilable enmity with the gospel of Jesus Christ, and eminently promotes the cause of Anti-trinitarianism wherever it prevails. But does not the system known by the name of Hopkinsianism, as naturally and necessarily promote and support the same heresy? Under the mask of friendship to Calvinism, and opposition to Arminianism, does it not more effectually and thoroughly, if possible, raze foundations?

Does it not subvert the bible doctrines of "God's sovereignty and holiness, and man's sinfulness and dependence," and place in their room chimeras, the invention of a mental philosophy, falsely so called? If Arminianism be *a* mother of Unitarianism, and Universalism, and Infidelity, and Atheism, is she *the only* mother. If she be *the only* mother of these pernicious delusions in New-England, what harlot, or what "mother of harlots," brought forth all the numerous Hopkinsian progeny with which N. E. and other parts of the United States are overrun? The genuine, the intelligent and the consistent friend of truth need be at no loss to answer these questions, if he has the opportunity and takes the pains to compare Hopkinsianism with Arminianism, and both those *isms* with Unitarianism, Universalism and Infidelity, and to examine the course of events in the church of Christ, for some years past, particularly in N. E. and in that church calling itself "the Presbyterian Church" in the United States. It is a gross breach of that charity which "rejoices not in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth," to conceal the fact, that Hopkinsianism is as inveterate an "enemy to God and his truth," and in proportion to its extent, as prolific a "mother of these pernicious delusions," as Arminianism. But there is and has been, a marked difference since the origin of Hopkinsianism. Arminianism is more consistent, more candid, and more open. Hopkinsianism practices more secrecy and stratagem in its mode of warfare; has no fixedness of position, it is here, it is there, it is gone. "*Proper explanation*" makes it as intangible and invisible as a spirit. Learned Doctors and Professors of Theology, Vigilant Committees and solemnly constituted Courts of Jesus Christ, as sworn Watchmen on the walls of Zion, cannot grasp it; cannot descry it. Hopkinsianism bearing more prominently the character of an adulteress, more generally than Arminianism, generates its illegitimate offspring under the mask of a marriage covenant with a different profession. Thus the "great work" of ruining "the strength and order, the beauty and glory" of the church of Christ, silently but rapidly goes on, under the name and profession of Orthodoxy and Evangelical Religion, and a zeal for "the sovereignty and holiness of God, and the sinfulness and dependence of man," not as laid down in the scriptures of truth, but as dictated by the great Idol of Unitarianism, Arminianism and Hopkinsianism, viz. corrupt and blind human reason. "The war is not closed; the battle is not fought,

and the victory cannot be gained, until the wisdom and strength of God are exalted against the folly and wickedness of man." And this victory never will be achieved, while a confederacy with error, or false peace, and ambiguity, and equivocation, and mental reservation are the order of the day : and professions and oaths, and ordination vows, and ecclesiastical courts, affecting to be "Thrones of Judgment" for the Lord Jesus Christ, are employed as bulwarks of defence for error ; and masked batteries from which its screened and tortuous advocates may play their volleys with most success. Are we friends of the ancient and scriptural order and beauty of the Lord's house, let "the weapons of our warfare" be directed with most assiduity, perseverance and poignancy against the concealed, the skulking, and deceitful "enemies of God and his Truth."

C. D.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

CHARGE TO THE REV. JAMES M'CARREL AT HIS INSTALLATION TO THE PASTORAL INSPECTION OF THE ASSOCIATE CONGREGATION OF UPPER PINEY, AND ITS BRANCHES, BY THE REV. DAVID BLAIR.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER—This day has been appointed by the Presbytery, at a former meeting, for the purpose of solemnizing your pastoral relation to this congregation.—The relation has now been notified judicially in the presence of that God who hath founded Zion, and chosen it for his habitation. This day is to you not a common day, it is awfully solemn, it is the beginning of months, and the first month in the year to the interesting particulars of your future history. Bear with me then, whilst, from a strong regard to your welfare, I call to your remembrance and attention certain considerations, which are of the utmost importance in the proper discharge of ministerial duty.

1. You should never forget the transcendently great work to which you are called in this congregation. What is that work ? (It may be mentioned ; for the more perfectly it has been examined by you, you are thus more inclined to examine it.) It is to make known the tender mercies of our God to perishing sinners. It is particularly to make them acquainted with their sinful and miserable state by nature. It is to warn them of the wrath to come—to call them to faith on the Son of God, to repentance, and new obedience. It is to dispense the sacraments of the new covenant, which, on the part of God, are the pledges of his unshaken

love, and on the part of the receiver, are the symbols of gratitude, faith and obedience. In a word, your work is to promote the glory of God in the salvation of sinners, ready to perish. The work is a great work, not to be measured by the concerns of time, neither can time tell it. It is to be seen in the light of the glory of God, the light of eternity, and in the salvation of souls exposed to perdition. It is enough to call forth all the talent and powers that God hath given you, and to make you labor in season, and out of season.

2. In your preparation for the pulpit, make choice of those subjects to which you have reason to believe you are called by the providence of God, rather than those, on which you may at first view, consider yourself best prepared. This remark touches a point of vital importance in ministerial preparation. For however great may be your resources from reading and study, they will soon be exhausted, and variety, notwithstanding your most indefatigable exertions, will come to an end, and your discourses will be to yourself, and your hearers, as a tale that hath been told, if a sense of God's directing, and commanding authority, should fail to influence your mind ; but a well grounded sense, that the tidings you bring to this people is a message from God, will make your subjects ever new and interesting. It will open the eyes of your understanding, it will awaken the finest feelings of your own heart, and it will give you more power in the arrangement and delivery of your discourse, than could be obtained from the best schools on earth. Seek then after this sacred fire ; it is not enthusiasm, neither is it the ardour of human nature, nor is it caught in the schools : it is kindled by a live coal from the altar of God, and they alone feel it, who sustain the true character of ambassadors for Christ. They beseech as though God did beseech, and pray sinners, as in Christ's stead, saying, be "ye reconciled to God."* This knowledge of the

* Those who have read the British Spy, will not fail to remember the interesting description given of the old blind preacher, Mr. Waddel, who is so happily brought out of obscurity by the eloquent author, who chanced to hear him on a sacramental occasion. Why was it that the Attorney General, on retiring from the congregation, tried in vain to pronounce like the old preacher the following quotation. "Socrates died like a Philosopher, but Jesus Christ like a God." The reason was this, the old man labored under the burden of the word of the Lord to perishing sinners, which quickened his heart, and awakened his soul, and taught him, as never man taught, how to emphasize. Whereas

mind of God is obtained by prayer—by the knowledge of his revealed will, and the true state of religion in this congregation. From these sources you may know what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.

3. See that a work of saving grace prospers in your own soul. Without this you can have no heart to the work of the ministry. You must know the worth of your own soul, before you can know the worth of the souls of others. You must know the wormwood and the gall of a state of nature, and taste and see that God is good, before you can make known to sinners their deplorable situation, and call them to the blessedness of a life of faith. The work of the ministry, dear Brother, is a work of experience. It is from experience to experience. It has nothing to do with the understandings of men, independent of their hearts. It is learned then, not from theoretical speculation, but from the practical school of the economy of grace. Talents and learning must be sanctified, before they are fit for the work. Seek then the grace of God on your own soul, to all the extent that it is promised in the gospel to sinners. It will lead you into all truth. It will give you an intuitive knowledge of the work to which God is daily calling you. It will give you easy access to the minds of all in distress, and will qualify you for pouring into their wounded spirits the consolation of the gospel. And it will support you under the many privations and troubles, to which you are exposed in this life of trial.

4. Make known the whole counsel of God to this congregation, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. You hold your commission from God, and to him you are accountable. It will sustain you in the maintenance of his cause, for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee. True it is, you have received your office from the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, and your settlement here was dependent on the call of this congregation ;

the Attorney General labored under the burden of imitation, which always operates as a dead weight on the natural faculties.

It is said of Garrick, that when speaking of Mr. Whitefield, he said he would rather than a thousand pounds he could use the interjection Oh, like Whitefield. Such a gift was not to be purchased with money. Could he have changed his calling truly, to that of an ambassador from God, commissioned to warn men of the wrath to come, and entreat them to accept of pardon and break off from sin, then, and not till then, could he say Oh, like Whitefield.

but the Presbytery ordained you to be a minister of God, and the congregation called you in the same capacity. You may therefore bid defiance to any association of men, formed against you in the ministry, however imposing may be their names, and however specious be their pretences, in a perfect consistency with all the obedience which you have vowed to the Presbytery ; and you may shake off the dust of your feet for a testimony against this congregation, when they refuse to hear the true and faithful sayings of him that sent you. Nothing on earth can deprive you of your high calling, but infidelity to your Lord and master. Let not then the fear of man's wrath, nor the hope of man's favor, control you as a minister of the gospel. If you do, your love to religious truth will soon become cold, and you will give yourself up to a detestable neutrality, in matters which concern the glory of God, and the salvation of souls. Beware however of a rock on the opposite shore, against which men are apt to run in avoiding this danger of which we have been warning you, that is, dwelling on the minor matters of religion, to the neglect of the weightiest matters, and straining them out from their proper place, until they are united with the doctrines, and commandments of men, in a new system of Pharisaical religion. This is a very dangerous source of error, doubly dangerous as it wears the visage of superlative zeal and orthodoxy. It is infatuating to narrow minds, and minds tenacious of trifles, and is often allied to deep dishonesty ; for the man, who strains at a gnat and swallows a camel, is not to be trusted beyond his own interest. This was a remarkable trait in the Jewish character, during the time of our Saviour. They tithed mint, and rue, and all manner of herbs, and passed over judgment, mercy, faith, and the love of God. Guard therefore against this dangerous source of error and apostacy ; it is not indeed the great source of error in our times, but it is a source of error, as it was a source of error, and it always will be a source of error, wherever man dwells. It is, like every other moral disease, infectious in its nature. It begins in substituting the smallest matters in religion in the room of the greatest. The pins, and all the light matters of the temple, for the foundation stones, and ends by embracing the doctrines and commandments of men, as the principles on which our eternal life depends.

5. Give yourself wholly to the work of the ministry. It is your calling. It opens

to you a field which if well cultivated, will require your whole labor and attention. The work is so great indeed, that, if viewed in its proper importance, you will be more willing to consider it as above your capacity, than as a part of your employment. Who is sufficient for these things! exclaimed the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when considering the awful responsibility and consequences of the gospel ministry. Those worldly employments, then, that are lawful to other men, and justly occupy the greater part of their time and attention, are unlawful to you, so far as they withdraw your attention from the business of your high calling, and disqualify you for the discharge of duty. Remember that the Priesthood had no inheritance separate from the tribes of Israel. When the land was divided by lot, the Lord was their inheritance. They stood by the altar, and were to live by the altar. The disciples of Jesus were sent out to preach the gospel, without any farther provision than is contained in these words. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." They went forth, and were supported. Go thou to this people and do likewise. The glad tidings which you bring will make you a welcome messenger, and your comfortable support will be secured by those who receive from your hands the bread of life, and the water of salvation.

6. Remember that your success, as a minister of the gospel, depends entirely on the blessing of God. He said to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and compassion on whom I will have compassion." Let this well settled and humbling truth in our holy religion, have its full influence on your public and private life, as it begins in revelation with the first discoveries of the mercy of God to his church, and has been confirmed and expounded at every subsequent period of revelation with the highest emphasis, so let it pervade your ministerial work from first to last. Let it enter into all your prayers, into the composition and delivery of every discourse; and when you discover that your labor has been successful, give God the glory. You are only the instrument, he has done the work; for of him, and through him, and to him are all things. Go then in his strength, looking for his counsel to direct you, and relying on his arm for your support; and unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion, and power, both now, and ever. Amen.

To the people of this congregation, as they now stand responsible to God, for the privilege of a gospel ministry, we have to make a few remarks—

Dear Brethren—from the situation in which you have been placed by the mysterious Providence of God, who hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of our habitation, we know that he hath given you for many days the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction. Raised up in different parts of the world, where public ordinances were enjoyed with regularity, you have met here in the wilderness, as exiles from the house of your heavenly Father, and wept for years the loss of privileges, which you had no power to regain. You have spent many a silent sabbath. The sacred day returned, but its ordinances did not return to you. It would not be going too far to say, that on some occasions you almost despaired of the return of a stated gospel ministry in your own day, and that you dreaded the alarming consequences of raising your families in life, and leaving them at death, destitute of these ordinances. But these fears are this day dispelled; unbelief is rebuked, and faith confirmed. What was yours heretofore only in general promise, is yours to day in particular Providence. God said it, and he hath made it good, "although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come. Thine eyes shall see thy teachers, and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, this is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left."

1. As you now enjoy the public ordinances of the gospel, see that ye attend to them with constancy. Occasional hearers, and occasional communicants, cannot expect to be benefitted by ordinances. It is the man who waits at the pool, who has the opportunity of being healed when the angel of the covenant troubles the waters of the sanctuary. He may be washed from all his filthiness by the water of life, whilst others, who absent themselves from the fountain remain in their native pollution. By voluntarily absenting yourselves one day, you may deprive yourselves of the best opportunity of knowing your true situation before God, the blessings of the Gospel, as they are adapted to your particular wants, or the particular temptations to which you are exposed in life; or you may grieve the Holy Spirit who begins and carries on the work of spi-

ving grace in the heart. These considerations should be well weighed by those, who, from trifling excuses, neglect divine ordinances, and cause the minister of the gospel to preach to empty pews, those discourses which were calculated to promote the salvation of sinners through Jesus Christ.

2. Hear your minister preach the gospel, that you may receive instruction and spiritual improvement by his instrumentality. Many hear the gospel for no other purpose than to judge of the merits of the performance. The minister's qualification as a preacher, is the alpha and omega of their concern with him. They go to hear a preacher. They sit in judgment on him as a preacher during the delivery of his discourse, and afterwards never think of his ministrations, for any other purpose, but to praise them or blame them, as they think fit. There is a time when it is the duty of a people to examine the qualifications of a preacher, and decide according to the best of their judgment, whether he be well qualified to promote their edification, and the cause of Christ within their bounds. This decision does not go on the supposition, that the decision of the Presbytery respecting his qualifications to preach the gospel is called in question. The Presbytery decides on general principles, that the person commissioned by them is qualified to preach the gospel, and it is left to the people to decide who of those commissioned may be best qualified to promote their edification. You have come to a conclusion on this matter. At a former meeting of the Presbytery you presented a call to your present minister, and said in that call, that you believed the King and head of the church had bestowed on him such ministerial gifts and endowments, as may render him useful among you; and, after hearing him now for a considerable time, you say this day unanimously without any hesitation, that you abide by the same call. You abide by a good decision. And it is not merely your decision. This Presbytery, in the utmost cordiality, approve of what you have done. Know then that this matter is settled. The time for deciding on the ministerial gifts and endowments of your preacher is past. To profit by these gifts and endowments should be your constant aim. Wait then at the posts of wisdom's gate to hear what God will say to your souls. Hear not for curiosity, but that your souls may live.

3. Let your minister have an interest in your prayers. "Brethren pray for us," was the request of an inspired apostle. With

how much greater reason do ministers, who lay no claim to inspiration, ask an interest in the prayers of their people! Brethren we stand in much need of your prayers, for great is that account which we must render to God. Arduous is our task, and various are the qualifications necessary for the work. The greatest qualifications have to come as a continued bestowment of divine grace. Let therefore, as we said before, your minister have an interest in your fervent prayers. The Lord has made this your duty; he has given you reason in the promises of the gospel to believe that your prayers will be heard, and the exercise itself is salutary on your own hearts. It will prepare your minds for receiving instruction, it will solemnize your affections, and it will cause you to enter the congregation as you ought, believing that God is there, and that he reigns sovereign in the dispensations of grace.

4. Give your minister a sufficient worldly support. Hear the decisions of the oracles of God on this point. 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. "Do you not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." This is not the ordinance of man, it is indeed agreeable to the most obvious principles of right reason; it is an ordinance founded on the law of nature; but added to this, it has the positive authority of the Son of God. The Lord hath ordained. What hath he ordained? Is it that they who preach the gospel must live by farms, by some of the arts or sciences, or by common schools, or by merchandize, or that they must be rich before they enter the ministry; or that they must live in want? Such constructions are hostile to the meaning of his words. All know, that to live by the gospel, is to have from the gospel a competent worldly support. On this point I might say much, but I forbear. You who know the value of gospel ordinances, support them. Let not your minister have reason for disagreeable and hard thoughts respecting your liberality.

Allow him to be free, as much as possible, from the concerns of the world, and let him have from your hands, not only the necessities, but the comforts of life. Take religion into the bill of your expenses, and let it be the first item on the list. Let liberality, uncramped by the gripings of avarice, characterize your procedure, and let there be a regularity in the discharge of

your obligations, like the regularity of days and months. This course which we prescribe is the course of duty. It accords with the sentiments of every honest heart, and is connected with your best interests in life; for saith the scriptures, "honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine."

5. Beware lest any root of bitterness spring up among you, and thereby many be defiled. You are a young congregation, and on this account more easily hurt. Be stedfast in the faith. The ministry with which you are now favored should be a stay to you, that you be not carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men, and the cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive. Cultivate peace and brotherly love; remember that if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand. Let the session study fidelity towards God, and harmony amongst themselves, and tenderness to the weak of the flock. Let the congregation support the decisions of the session, with all due respect, and study to live together as the heirs of eternal life. And to those who do not consider themselves as belonging to the congregation we would say, in connexion with those who do belong to it, that there is a great, and terrible day approaching, when it will be seen, that all who live within the reach of a preached gospel, must answer for their distinguishing privileges, and settle this weighty matter in their final account. That you may all be prepared for that day, we call upon you to lay a proper stress on that unity and harmony, which is urged so earnestly in the gospel of Christ. If, saith Paul to the Philipians, "there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." Guard against strife, vain glory and selfishness. Like the pestilence that walketh in darkness, these dispositions are ever ready to press into the church of Christ. Cultivate humility, self denial and brotherly love. These dispositions dwelt in Jesus, who is a perfect pattern to his followers. Let therefore the same mind be in you that was in him. By following his example you will rise above the sinfulness and misery which belong to human nature in its present state, and come to the pleasures which are at his right hand, where he now reigns in glory, and will

reign, until all his faithful followers participate in the unspeakable blessings which he purchased, by "making himself of no reputation, and taking upon himself the form of a servant, and becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." May God of his infinite mercy enable you to lay these things seriously to heart.

[From the Spirit of the Pilgrims.]

DO THYSELF NO HARM.

"Do thyself no harm" by *believing false doctrines*.—The mental constitution of man is from the same hand that framed his physical structure. God has assigned laws to each, and in neither case can these be transgressed with impunity.

What revelation has declared, experience has illustrated; that *truth* is the aliment divinely appointed to nourish the soul. The Saviour prayed for his disciples, 'Sanctify them through *thy truth*; *thy word is truth*.' Here the truth, divinely revealed, is recognized as the instrument of sanctification. But the truth, to take effect, must at least be believed. It must be received into the understanding. It is not enough that it lies on the table, if it be not stored in the mind. No man is so insane as to hope, because food is prepared and is on his table, that therefore he shall live, eat it or not.—Neither should any one be so irrational as to expect spiritual health and growth, mental expansion, heart enlargement, the soul's salvation without embracing that truth which God hath revealed for this specific purpose. But if it be thus necessary to believe the truth, it is plain to demonstration that we must not embrace errors, which are *fundamentally subversive of this truth*.

You have flattered yourself that the *nature* of your opinions was of little importance—that *sincerity* in them was enough. But rest assured that sincerity in the belief of error is widely different from believing the truth. Did you never hear of a person's taking poison, sincerely believing it to be a wholesome medicine? And did his sincerity arrest the laws of nature? Did the poison forget its virulence and become harmless and nutritious, because of his sincerity? On the contrary, was not his sincerity the very thing which ruined him? Had he indulged any suspicions, he might have examined with care before he took the poison; or he might have prevented its effects after he had taken it, by timely preventives. But his apprehensions were not awakened.—He felt no alarm. He sincerely believed it

a wholesome medicine, and his sincerity destroyed him.

Sincerely believing ice to be fire, will not convert it into fire. Sincerely believing stones to be bread will not render them nutritious. Nor will sincerely believing error to be truth alter at all its destructive nature. Suppose a man should take a quantity of flour, and an equal quantity of arsenic, and comparing them together should, conclude, that one was just as well calculated to preserve life as the other. He might say, 'I can see no great difference between the two; I can feel no difference; I can smell no difference. I can perceive no reason why one should preserve life, and the other destroy it. I am under no obligations to believe what I cannot understand,—nor do I believe it. I am sincerely of the opinion that this arsenic is just as good to preserve life, as that flour.' And having reasoned thus learnedly, he proves his sincerity by swallowing the poison. Yet, notwithstanding his sincerity, he is a dead man—Yea, *in consequence* of his sincerity, he is a dead man. It is just because he really and sincerely believed what he professed, that he took the poison and destroyed his life.—Sincerity does not reverse or suspend the laws of nature, either in the physical or moral world. It rather gives efficiency and certainty to those laws.

Suppose (and the case is not wholly without a parallel) that a foreigner, recently landed on our shores from some of the arbitrary governments of Europe, should sincerely believe that, having now reached a land of liberty, he might freely appropriate to his own use whatever he desired; and proceeding on this his sincere belief, suppose he should rob the first man, or steal the first horse that came in his way. Would the sincerity of his belief snatch him from the arrest of justice? Would the Judge and the jury confirm his sincere belief; or would they confine his person? His sincerity in this case has lodged him in a prison. It was the sincere belief of a dangerous and foolish error that turned him aside from the path of honesty and duty, and led him to commit a crime by which his liberty is forfeited.

Some of the pirates, executed not long since for murder on the high seas, are said to have declared on the gallows, that they believed there was no God, no heaven, no hell, no retribution, no hereafter. That they were *sincere*, it should seem there can be no doubt; for they published the declaration with their dying breath. Were they justifiable or excusable in their belief? Do you

say, No? But who are you that undertake to decide what another ought, or ought not, to believe? They sincerely believed there was no God, and their sincerity was tested at the end of the halter; and why were they not justifiable? You will reply doubtless, as I should, that there is light enough, even from the works of God, to teach any person that he is. Before these men could have become Atheists, they must have closed their eyes to the light of day, and their consciences to the light of heaven. They loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. Their sincere belief of error arose entirely from their love of sin. They wanted no God and they would believe in none. They heartily desired that he should not be, and they sincerely believed that he was not. Their sincerity therefore, is found, on examination, to be not their excuse, but their fault; not their misfortune, but their crime. Instead of palliating their guilt, it is itself the most portentous mark in the long catalogue of their sins.

And what is true in this case, is true in all analogous cases. Sincerity in the belief of essential error is never any excuse for such error. So far from justifying those who embrace it, it aggravates their condemnation. Take the Deist, who, professing to believe in God, rejects his word. Will his sincere rejection of Christ and the gospel save him? How strange it would be, if a sincere rejection of Christ, and a sincere acceptance of him, should lead to the same results—should entitle to the same blissful rewards?

No, reader, we must sincerely reject error, and sincerely believe and embrace the truth. And we must be careful not to mistake human error, for heavenly truth; man's wishes, for God's revelation.

'Do thyself no harm,' by believing and embracing false doctrines. W. S.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

MR EDITOR—I have sent you these two extracts at present, and propose to send you others in course, as additional to the Dissertations on the Divinity of Christ, more fully to enervate the Arian, Socinian and Unitarian heresies which so much prevail at present.

QUISLIBET.

The following extract is contained in a note to a discourse, entitled "Advice to Christians to contend for the *faith* once delivered to the Saints, from Jude 3, preached to a society of young men in Jewan-street,

on Easter Monday, 1719, by Mr. John Cumming, M. A. minister of the Scots Church in London.—“I say more abstractly the *Word* or *Logos*. It is well known that one of the main arguments by which the Arians think they disprove the Supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is drawn from that natural priority, and dependence which we see in temporary generations.—The perpetual clamor is, that there must be a necessary subordination between the Father and the Son. This argues the grossness of their conceptions, when they pretend to measure God, by what is really an imperfection in his creature. And if their notions on this head were but nicely scanned, or if they would tell us what they mean by the *generation* of the Son, when they apply it to his *divine nature*, I am of opinion, if they intend any thing else but a proper *creation*, their doctrine would exactly agree with the ancient theory of the Valentinians, some of which sect conceived of such a *probole*, or *emission*, as I am unwilling to express in plainer terms. But their triumphs are vain and presumptuous, unless they could prove,—*First*, that an eternal generation involves a manifest contradiction; which they are never able to do. Dr. Clark, acknowledges, in a letter to one of his side, that the Son's being eternally begotten by absolute necessity of nature, would infer his *self-existence* and *independency*. In opposition to which, (for he will by no means allow that our blessed Lord is in any respect self-existent, or independent,) he asserts that he was begotten, not by absolute *necessity of nature*, but by the *will* and *power* of the Father. And though, in his paper laid before the Bishops, July 2, 1714, (which his learned friend says looked very like a *retraction*, but was not really such,) he uses the words *eternally begotten*. Yet when taxed by the same gentleman with inconsistency, and giving up the whole cause, he explains away that eternity into a *pro panton aionon*, for, or before all ages, and will not be thought to intend the absolute eternity of a self-existent necessary Being, or a Being without original. So that, by *eternally begotten*, he meant no such thing as *eternally begotten*. Such advantage have they, who can reconcile the declaring their faith in words of a double *entendre*, that is, in deceitful words, with the utmost simplicity and sincerity! But be this as it will, to say that the Son was begotten by the *will* and *power* of the Father, so that the Father alone is the *eternal necessary Being*, is a position without any

proof, and absolutely inconsistent with the Son's being God, in any other than a *figurative* sense. And therefore, those who assert the eternal generation of the Son, as God, in the highest and most proper sense of the words, mean by it such an *emanation* as is by absolute necessity of nature, and proves the Son to be of the same essence, and equally self-existent with the Father. And, unless the adversaries could prove such a *necessary* generation to be impossible, (which is absolutely impossible for them to do,) nothing can be objected from this topic to disprove the independency and self-existence of the Son.—But then,

Secondly, their boasts on this head are vain, unless they could undeniably prove that the *generation* of Christ mentioned in scripture, or those texts in which he is styled the *Son of God*, are, in strictness of speech, to be understood of his divine pre-existent nature, without any respect to his being the *Messias*. If those places which call him the son of God, or the only begotten Son, are meant of him, not as Theos, or Logos, considered absolutely, but as Theanthropos, or Loganthropos, invested with the office of mediator, then all their sophistical reasonings for a subordination of the Son to the Father are cut off at once, since no sober Christian ever denied a subordination in respect of office and humanity, but only in respect of the divine nature and essence. The Son, as the Messias, is subordinate; but the *Word*, or *Logos*, is God.

I know our adversaries will here insist on the concessions of the orthodox: But it is a poor way of reasoning if they build upon it, and comes with a very ill grace from those who declaim so much against human authorities and interpretations.—If any should venture to illustrate the argument by other proofs, without urging that of generation, and should put it upon them to prove that the divinity ascribed to our blessed Lord in scripture, is founded in his sonship, it would entangle them in their reasonings, and perhaps beat them out of their main fort. But, I see not that it would weaken the argument on the side of those who maintain the equality of the Son, (the divine person so called) with the Father. I doubt not but the principle of the son's being eternally begotten of the Father, by “absolute necessity of nature,” (which Dr. Clark denies, because, as he acknowledges, it would infer self-existence, and independency, and substitutes in the room of it, a precarious arbitrary generation,) is proof against all their cavils. But, if one should express himself other-

wise, and say, it is essential to the eternal God-head, that in the unity of the divine nature there should be three persons, or subsistencies, of one substance, power and glory, who in scripture are distinguished by the name of *Father, Son* and *Holy Ghost*, as well as by other relative properties; and should prove this from those texts which assert the *oneness or unity of God*, or from those which, without any qualification or restriction, ascribe all the characters of divinity or the *incommunicable* perfections of the eternal God-head to the *sacred three*, (who are distinguished by personal properties and actions, not by a diversity of nature, or absolute perfection of Being.) If any, I say, should take this way of managing the argument, he might very easily refute the most plausible objections of our adversaries, without being obliged to dive into the inexplicable *theories* of an eternal generation and procession.* But, this I would have the reader carry along with him; that we must distinguish between the *article itself*, as it is a necessary part of faith, and the different ways of proving the same doctrine, (for a proper explanation of what is so far above all natural discoveries, would be a vain attempt, and is barred by the Apostle's words, "without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness.")

The article itself, as revealed in scripture, cannot be better expressed than in the words of our Shorter Catechism, viz. "there is but one only, the living and true God: There are three persons in the God-head, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." This is the scripture doctrine of the trinity. These propositions are not remote consequences drawn from the words of revelation, but the natural, and necessary meaning of those innumerable texts of scripture that relate to this matter. Considered in one view, who ever denies these positions, or advances any explanation manifestly inconsistent with them, who derogates from the unity of God, (unity of nature or essence,) or from the true eternal God-head of the Word and Spirit, viz. that they are one God with the Father, or overthrows the scriptural distinction between the blessed three, may justly be charged with denying the faith once delivered to the saints, in this great and fundamental article of our religion.—But, different methods of illustration, consistent with hold-

ing the article itself, as above expressed, can infer no disadvantage to the truth or cause of revealed religion."

Correspondent to the preceeding extract, the following is taken from Bradbury's Sermons on the Mystery of Godliness. pp. 780—785.

"Another grand objection is taken from that mysterious word, that the Holy Spirit is pleased to make use of in calling Christ "the only begotten of the Father."—The liberty that is used with that phrase has so much of "filthiness and foolish talking," that we ought not without the severest caution to take it into our lips. Upon this they found their notion of his being *derived*.—A certain author, by telling the story so often in his pamphlets, shows how full he is of his repartee: When he was asked if Christ was underived, he waved it off by putting another question whether he was *unbegotten*: and how easily might an Atheist put a third, which I shall not mention? May I not say of those men, "spots they are, and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings, while they feast with you." 2 Pet. ii. 13. What scandalous things *Servetus* fetched out of this word, some of you may know, and the rest of you need not. I had rather leave such objections in their own shame than pretend to answer them

But, 1st. You are very sensible this measuring an infinite nature by a finite, is the way to plunge at once into confusion and blasphemy. "These filthy dreamers defile the flesh." The great God has been pleased to make use of that language that obtains among ourselves, but it is impossible to understand him in such a sense as the words have in human nature, without becoming "vain in our own imaginations." We must give up every perfection of the Deity, if we do not throw out of these phrases all those things that signify the weakness of a creature.

Thus his having hands and eyes, and feet, may be pleaded against his being a Spirit, as they are by some Socinian writers. The words anger, grief, revenge, pity and love would hurry us to believe, that he is of like passions with ourselves, if we did not controul the sound of them with this thought, that he is God and not man. With these guards and distinctions ought you to consider that awful term that the Holy Ghost has adopted into his book. For though we read of Christ as "the only begotten of the Father," yet "who shall declare his generation?" As the word itself

* This has been done in the first dissertation on the divinity of Christ. Part III. Religious Monitor, pages 223-229.

cannot possibly signify *that* in the divine nature that it does in the human; methinks it is revealed on purpose to shun the imagination of men, and show them that it means something which they know not. "Agur," perhaps, had given too much sway to these enquiries, for which he saith, "I am more brutish than any man, and have not the understanding of a man, I neither learned wisdom, nor have the knowledge of the holy." We may suppose of what nature these things are, that he was ignorant of, by the next words: Who has ascended up into heaven, or descended? Who has gathered the winds in his fists? Who has bound the waters in a garment? Who has established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell? Prov. xxx. 2, 3, 4.

2d, That it does not signify a derivation of nature in the way that it must do when we use it of one another, is plain from all those scriptures that speak of Christ as they do of the Father. He would never have been called Alpha and Omega, "the first and the last, the beginning and the ending," or said to be "from everlasting," and "before all things," if his being was received from another. It destroys indeed the *Sabellian* fancy, and proves him to be distinct from the Father, for the word Son carries in it the name of another person: and though in us it would signify a beginning, yet we cannot admit it in him without a sponge upon those passages in the bible, that tell us quite the contrary. He cannot be the *everlasting Father*, if he is a derived Son, nor is he *before all things*, if any thing was before him.

3d. The most apparent design of the word, I think, is to express an identity or sameness of nature between the Father and the Son; that we are to conceive of the one as we do of the other. To be sure this was never designed to explain the *manner* of his derivation, and therefore I see no necessity to understand it of any derivation at all. For whenever it is used among creatures, it is to tell us that the being is exactly the same in the parent and the offspring. The time of existence is only a circumstance. The last child that was born into the world has the same human nature with Adam himself: and the characters of priority and subjection, of forming sooner or later, being stronger or weaker, make no difference in the nature itself. The son is as much a man as the father; and it would be an odd way of arguing, when I say that a man and his son are equal in nature, by

which I mean they are equally rational, spiritual, and immortal, and whatever is essential to human nature, for any to cut me short and say, that the Father was *before* the Son: *that* does not enter into the question; human nature is the same in a child as in a parent, in a subject as in a king. All these individuals have no other distinction among them but what is circumstantial: as to the nature itself they are equal, the same in essence.

Now though priority and succession are neither essential nor contradictory to human nature, yet they are so to the divine. It is necessary in God that he be the first, "before all things;" and therefore if any one has a beginning, he may be glorious, but he cannot be God, because he must want that which is the grand essential of deity. So that the question is not, whether Christ has a glorious capacity above every other being, whether he has not an existence before them, and inconceivably above them, this does not denominate him a God.

If he is begotten of the Father, and yet have not the same nature with the Father, the word must be taken in a sense that it never would bear any where else. If it is designed to express a derivation, it expresses what the Father has not; nay what is opposite to his nature, a downright contradiction to every notion of deity; and I cannot apprehend, that in making the Son an inferior, I shall ever answer the title of his being the only begotten Son of God.—Upon the whole, the word is to signify something; the *manner* of derivation it cannot, the *time* it does not, and if it signifies the *derivation* itself, it argues a different nature, for a communicated divinity is a jar upon what we always mean by divinity.

4th. It is certain, that this word is applied to some *periods* that cannot refer to the Son's derivation of an existence from the Father. This miraculous conception in the Virgin *Mary* is brought as one ground of the title, "Therefore the holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The stand that the Socinians make here we all of us know. They tell you, that at this time he begun to be, but that is an error that is out of fashion at present; another is uppermost in the wheel, though I believe it will not continue long so.—Will any one now say from this scripture, that the only reason of his being called the Son of God was such a conception? Had he not the title antecedent to it, and independent on it?—Another period is his resurrection. Then he was "declared to be

the Son of God with power." Rom. i. 4. But the phrase itself plainly signifies, not his entering into the name, but giving it a new discovery and manifestation. The Apostle applies what *David* had said long ago to that period, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." But will they say that the word signifies a derivation in this place? Was that indeed *the day* of his birth? Had he no existence till *then*? Every one gives up the meaning of the phrase; it is too gross to be contended for in *that scripture*, that they make it necessary in others; and therefore you need do no more upon their boasted argument, than change the situation of it; as for example, they plead, he that was begotten was derived. The word can signify nothing but a communication of being. Try whether it does or no upon the passage I have now given you. "God spake of a certain time, This day have I begotten thee, *i. e.* according to them, this is the day thou hast received thine existence; and therefore, if the word can bear no other sense but a derivation of being, it must signify that Christ began to be at his resurrection—It is plain that in this scripture it cannot refer to a communication of nature, for he was the Son of God in every sense of the word before; and therefore that interpretation is *not necessary* in all places which is *impossible* in *one*. If it *must not* signify derivation in this text, it *may not* do so in another. And perhaps the Holy Spirit has used it thus on purpose to shew us, that he never meant by it what one that is *carnally minded* tells us he does. It is essential to God that he be undervived, and so it must be to him who is the only begotten of the Father. If they have the divine nature equally, it is in all its perfection."

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,
CONFIRMED AND ILLUSTRATED BY PAS-
SAGES OF JOSEPHUS, THE JEWISH HISTO-
RIAN.

(Continued from page 300.)

Of the Samaritans.—The inhabitants of Samaria at this time were chiefly composed of the descendants of those colonies which, upon the captivity of the ten tribes, were, by the king of Assyria, transplanted into it from Babylon, and different countries which he had conquered. Being grievously distressed with lions on account of their idolatry in the land of Israel, they procured a priest to instruct them in the Jewish religion; but instead of embracing it purely, they mixed it with their native idolatry, or,

as scripture expresses it, "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods," 2 Kings, xvii. 33. The following is the account which Josephus gives of their conduct towards the Jews. "When they see the Jews in prosperity, they pretend that they are allied to them, and call them kinsmen, saying that they are the descendants of Joseph; but when they see them falling into a low condition, they say that they are no way related to them, and that the Jews have no right to expect any kindness from them, but they declare that they are sojourners from other countries."* The account of their behavior upon the return of the Jews from Babylonish captivity, which is given by Ezra and Nehemiah, agrees with this.

It appears from the New Testament, that one great ground of contention between the Jews and the Samaritans was, the stated place of public worship. This point of controversy is thus stated by the woman of Samaria in her conversation with Jesus: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship," John, iv. 20. The mountain to which the woman referred, was Gerizzim, which was the highest mountain in Samaria, and on which a temple had formerly stood. Josephus gives the following account of the erection of this temple: "Manasseh, the brother of Jaddua the high priest,† having married the daughter of Sanballat, the Samaritan governor, was declared incapable of the priest-hood, unless he should put her away. Sanballat, to prevail upon him to retain her, promised to build him a temple like that at Jerusalem, and to make him high priest of it. Having taken an early opportunity of making defection from Darius, and of going over to Alexander the Great, he obtained liberty from the conqueror to build a temple upon mount Gerizzim, of which he made his son-in-law the high priest. This contributed to widen the difference between the Jews and Samaritans. For "if

* Antiq. b. iv. ch. xiv. § 3.

† Some writers have asserted that this Manasseh was the son of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high-priest, and son-in-law to Sanballat, whom Nehemiah, on account of this connection, chased from him, Neh. xiii. 28. (See Brown's Dictionary of the Bible, article SAMARITANS, and Prideaux's Connections.) But this is certainly a mistake. For Manasseh was not the son of Joiada, but of Jonathan, (whom Josephus calls John,) and the grandson of Joiada the son of Eliashib, Neh. xii. 10, 11. And his father-in-law Sanballat was not that Horonite, who enjoyed the prefecture under Artaxerxes Longimanus, but a certain Cuthean or Samaritan of the same name, who succeeded Bogoses, who had been sent as Satrap in Samaria, by Darius, the last king of the Persians.

any one," says Josephus, "were accused by those of Jerusalem, of having eaten things common,* or of having broken the Sabbath, or of any crime of the like nature, he fled away to the Shechemites, (Shechem was at that time the metropolis of the Samaritans,) and said that he was accused unjustly."† We frequently find the Jews and Samaritans, even in foreign lands, carrying on this controversy about the place of worship. In Egypt there were disorders occasioned by this contention, "while those of Jerusalem said that their temple was holy, and resolved to send their sacrifices thither; but the Samaritans were resolved that they should be sent to mount Gerizzim."‡ And at Alexandria, there was a solemn disputation before Ptolemy Philometer between the two parties respecting the same affair, which was determined in favor of the Jews.§

Before the erection of the temple at Gerizzim, the Samaritans can scarcely be viewed in any other light than as Heathens, who, for selfish ends, had joined the worship of Jehovah with that of their own gods. After the defection of Manasseh, and the erection of the temple on mount Gerizzim, the gross idolatry and superstition of the Cutheans were purged; and as they became mixed with the Jews, so their religious services were brought nearer to the Jewish model. Hence *Samaritism*, from this period, has been considered by some learned men as a species of Judaism, although corrupt and schismatical. Indeed the Samaritans are spoken of in this light by some of the Jewish writers.|| Others mention that they acknowledged the Mosaic law according to the literal sense, and that they observed its precepts more punctually than the Jews themselves. In the gospels, we find the Samaritans claiming Jacob as their father, and expressing their faith in the Messiah as one in whom they were interested, John, iv. 12. 25.

Notwithstanding of this, the old Cuthean spirit was not extinguished. A remarkable instance of this occurred in the reign of An-

tiochus Epiphanes. When this furious tyrant had conquered Judea, polluted the temple of Jerusalem, and inflicted tortures upon those who would not forsake their religion,* the Samaritans sent ambassadors to him, to represent that they were not Jews, though their ancestors had been obliged to adopt certain Jewish rites on account of a plague which raged among them, and requesting their temple, which at that time had no name, might be called *The Temple of the Grecian Jupiter*.† This was an open renunciation of the religion of Moses.

But this storm having blown over, and the affairs of the Jews becoming more flourishing, the Samaritans returned to their former religious services. The temple on Gerizzim was demolished by John Hyrcanus the son of Simon Maccabeus about 200 years after it was built by Sanballat‡. But the Samaritans still worshipped on this mountain and the controversy between them and the Jews about the place of worship continued.

The arguments by which the respective parties endeavoured to defend their cause, as related by the Jewish Rabbis, were often equally futile. The following is a specimen. R. Ismael, the son of Joseph, going to Jerusalem to pray, passed by mount Gerizzim.—A certain Samaritan seeing him, asked him, Whither goest thou? To Jerusalem to pray. Would it not be better to pray in this blessed mount, than in that cursed one? I will tell you, replied the Jew, to whom you are like,—to a dog that is fond of carrion. You know that idols are hid in this mountain, according to Gen. xxxv. 4. What Jacob hid you greedily search for. Let us now hear the Samaritan pleading for his mountain. Rabbi Johannan, going to Jerusalem to pray, passed by this mount. A Samaritan seeing him, said, Whither goest thou? I go to pray at Jerusalem, said he.—Would it not be better for you, said the other, to pray in this blessed mount, than in that accursed house. How is this mountain blessed? said the Jew. Because, replied the Samaritan, it was not overflowed by the waters of the deluge. And being asked for a proof of this, he alledged Ezek. xxii. 24. "Son of man, say unto her, Thou art the land that is not cleansed, nor rained upon in the day of indignation."

But the Samaritans endeavored to support their cause with other, and more unjustifiable weapons. "Since men were born,"

* Here Josephus uses the very word *κοινοφαγία* the eating of things common for the eating of things unclean, which is the sense in which it is used in the New Testament. Acts, x. 14. 15. 28. Rom. xiv. 14.

† Antiq. b. xi. ch. vi. § 2. ch. viii. § 2. 4. 7.

‡ b. xii. ch. 1.

§ Antiq. b. xviii. ch. iii. § 4. The whimsical Whiston reckons it incumbent upon him to take the part of the Samaritans here, who he thinks got great injustice in this disputation. See his note on this passage of Josephus.

|| Inchaufin and Zemach David, quoted by Witsius, de decem tribubus Israelis, ch. iii. § 11.

* 2 Maccabees, ch. i.

† Antiq. b. xii. ch. § 5.

‡ It was built A. 332, and destroyed A. 130 before Christ.

says Owen, "there never was any thing attempted or perpetrated with more impious audacity by the most wicked men, for supporting the religion which they favored whether true or false, than these vile men did in corrupting the sacred books."* In the place of *Ebal*, they substituted the word *Gerizzim*, in Duet. xxvi. 4. and read it thus, "When ye be gone over Jordan, ye shall set up these stones in mount *Gerizzim*, and there shalt thou build an altar unto the Lord." But this is not all. They venture to add unto the decalogue, by putting their own impious act into the form of an eleventh precept, both in Exod. xx. and in the repetition of the law, Deut. v. This is to be found in all the copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch which remain. The following are the words as quoted by Dr. Owen, in his *Theologumena*, from the London Polyglot Bible: "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee unto the land of Canaan, which thou goest to possess, thou shalt raise up two great stones, and thou shalt daub them with mortar, and write upon these stones all the words of this law. And, after thou hast passed over Jordan, thou shalt place these stones which I command thee to-day, in the mount *Gerizzim*, and there thou shalt build an altar to the Lord thy God, an altar of stone, thou shalt not lift up iron upon it; of unhewn stones thou shalt build an altar to the Lord thy God and there thou shalt sacrifice thy peace-offerings, and eat and rejoice before the Lord thy God, in that mount beyond Jordan towards the west, in the land of the Canaanites inhabiting the plain beyond the region of Gilgal, beside the oak More towards Shechem." These words, they pretend, were delivered by God from mount Horeb, along with the rest of the law. This sufficiently shews how little credit is due to the Samaritan Pentateuch, when it differs from the Hebrew text.

It is uncertain at what time the Samaritans obtained the Pentateuch. Some have supposed that the priest, who was sent immediately after their first settlement in Samaria, to instruct them in the Jewish religion, translated it into their native tongue. But of this there are no ancient monuments. Some even doubt if they used it, as far down as the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; because, as they proposed to please him, by dedicating their temple to the Grecian Jupiter, and knew him to be an inveterate enemy to the sacred books, they would have gratified him by delivering up these to be destroyed.

* Owen's *Theologumena*, p. 299.

Neither is it certain at what time the corruptions in the Samaritan Pentateuch were made. Owen thinks it probable, that they were introduced during the time that the temple stood on mount *Gerizzim*, that is, before the reign of John Hyrcanus, the Jewish high-priest and governor.* What seems unfavorable to this opinion is, that when the earlier Rabbins accuse them of the falsification of the sacred text, they produce only minute instances of variation, but never mention this most gross depravation. Now, considering the great hatred which they entertained against the Samaritans, it is not probable that they would have passed over such a crime, if they could have accused them of it.†

Such were the occasions of the alienation and enmity which prevailed between the Jews and Samaritans. What has been said will serve to illustrate the force and import of different passages of the New Testament, particularly the first part of the 4th chapter of the gospel according to John. In going to Jerusalem, Jesus came to "a city of Samaria, which is called *Sychar*, near to the parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Now Jacob's well was there." This is the place which is elsewhere (Acts, vii. 16.) called *Sychem*, or *Shechem*. This city was the modern capital of the country of Samaria, more generally known afterwards by the name of *Neapolis*.‡ It was situated

* *Theologumena*, p. 396.

† See Witsius, *De decem tribubus Israelis*, cap. iii. 13.

‡ Jerom (in epitaphis Palæ) is of opinion, that *Sychar* has crept into John, iv. 5. by mistake for *Sychem*. But, in this he is inconsistent with himself; for, in another part of his writings, (*De locis Hebr.* lib. 10.) he mentions both *Sychar* and *Sychem* as near to *Neapolis*. Both Eusebius and Jerom seem to have looked upon these as the suburbs of the city *Neapolis*. But other writers, with more reason, consider them as different names for the same city. Adamanus, a writer of the seventh century, giving an account of the travels of Arculphus, a French bishop, in the Holy Land, says, that, "travelling through Samaria, he came to a city, which, in the Hebrew tongue, is called *Sychem*, in the Greek and Latin tongues *Sicima*, but which is corruptly pronounced *Sychar*. Without the walls of this city, a church is to be seen," erected upon the place which was supposed to be Jacob's well. Phocas a writer of the twelfth century, and who himself visited these places, anno 1135, says, "the metropolis of Samaria is *Sychar*, afterwards called *Neapolis*, situated between two hills, the foot of which serves for foundations to it, as far as it extends. At the foot of Mount *Gerizzim* is the ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, in which is Jacob's well.

Reland is of opinion, that the Jews gave the name of *Shecar* to this city, which they looked upon as idolatrous, and that the first syllable *She* was turned into *Si*, as *Shechem* was changed into *Sichem*. Accordingly, *Sychar* signifies a lie, falsehood, and

between the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim. At the foot of the latter was Jacob's well; hence the woman said to our Lord, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain." We formerly saw, that, according to Josephus, the Samaritans claimed descent from Joseph; agreeably to this, we find the Samaritan woman calling Jacob "our father," ver. 12.

When our Lord asked a draught of water from the Samaritan woman, she answered, "How is it, that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria?" To explain to his readers the reason of this answer, the evangelist adds, "for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans?" John iv. 9. This must be understood as referring to eating with them, or other instances of friendship and intimate familiarity. According to their traditions, it was not lawful for a Jew to borrow any thing of a Cuthean, to ask a favor, to receive a kindness, to drink of his water, or to eat of his morsel. But it was not understood to be inconsistent with their religion or customs, to carry on trade with them, or buy from them what they needed. Accordingly, we find that our Lord's disciples, who were not free from Jewish prejudices, and who wondered at his conversing with this woman, had gone, without any scruple, into the Samaritan city to purchase victuals, ver. 8. See also Luke, ix. 51.

Mutual injuries and affronts proceeded from this alienation. Josephus informs us, that, on the one hand, the Jews excluded the Samaritans from the temple of Jerusalem, because some of them had defiled it by throwing dead bodies into its cloisters;* and, on the other hand, the Samaritans maltreated the Jews when they passed through their country to sacrifice at Jerusalem. The following is an instance of this: "It was the custom of the Galileans, (the Jews inhabiting Galilee) when they came to the holy city at the festivals, to take their journeys through the countries of the Samaritans; and at this time there lay in the road they took a village called Ginoa, which was situated in the limits of Samaria and the great plain, where certain persons fought with the Galileans, and killed a great many of them."† This may serve to illustrate what happened to our Lord on one of his journeys from Galilee to Jerusalem: "He sent messengers before

his face, and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him; and they (the Samaritans) did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem," Luke, ix. 51.—53. Thus we see, that this antipathy was great and that it was mutual.

The conduct of our Lord exhibits a striking contrast to that of both Jews and Samaritans. On the one hand, he gives a decided preference to the cause of the Jews in their controversy as to the place and ordinances of worship; "Ye worship," said he to the Samaritan woman, "ye know not what; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews." At the same time, he embraced the opportunity of declaring, that he was about to put an end to the controversy about the place of worship: "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor at Jerusalem, worship the Father. The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him," ver. 21. 23. On the other hand, he testified, both by his doctrine and his practice, against the supercilious and inhospitable manner in which the Jews treated the Samaritans. He did not refuse friendly intercourse with them, and an interchange of the kind offices of humanity. How much superior to the illiberal and bitter spirit of his countrymen according to the flesh, does our Lord appear in his conduct to the Samaritans! When his disciples requested him to call down fire from heaven to revenge their inhospitality in refusing him admittance into one of their villages, he rebuked them and said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village." This spirit is still more apparent in the first parable which he appears to have spoken in public after this event. The design of it is to produce an instance of a person who had acted a humane and brotherly part, superior to the calls of interest, or the influence of national prejudice. He represents an inhabitant of Jerusalem as falling into the hands of thieves, by whom he was left half-dead. In this situation, he was disregarded by two of his own countrymen who passed by, the one a priest, and the other a Levite, but was compassionately relieved and kindly treated by—a Samaritan! To one of like passions with the Jews, and who had experienced the treatment which our Lord had lately met

refers either to the whole Samaritan worship which prevailed in that city, or to the worship of idols, of which the Jews accused them.

* Ant. b. xviii. ch. ii. § 2.

† b. xx. ch. vi. § 1.

with from the Samaritans, this would have afforded a fine opportunity of exposing their conduct and stigmatising a whole people on account of the misbehaviour of a few. Very different from this was the disposition of Jesus. The evangelist, having learned of his divine master, and under the influence of the same spirit, relating that of ten lepers, who were cured by our Lord, only one returned to give him thanks, adds "and he was a *Samaritan*," Luke, xvii. 16.

It appears from a quotation made above from Josephus, that in travelling between Galilee and Jerusalem, persons went through Samaria. From the accounts, given by the evangelists, of our Lord's journies, it is evident, that he took the same road. See Luke, ix. 51, 52, compared with verse 7. In John, iv. 3, 4, it is said, "He left Judea, and departed again into Gallilee; and he must needs go through Samaria." Compare this with the following passage of Josephus, in his own life. "I wrote," says he, "to my friends in Samaria to take care that they might safely pass through the country, for Samaria was already under the power of the Romans; and it was *absolutely necessary* for those that go quickly, to pass through that country; for, in that road, you may, in three days time, go from Galilee to Jerusalem."

PHILISTOR.

ON RENEWING THE COVENANT IN SCOTLAND, 1596.

How the covenant was renewed in Synods, I take the provincial synod of Fife, holden at Dunfermline, the 12th of May, for an example. After exhortation made by Mr. William Scott, minister at Coupar, Mr. James Melvine was chosen moderator. The articles of reformation, set down in the last assembly, were read distinctly in public audience, and ordained to be inserted in the books of the synod, and every presbytery was commanded to have a copy thereof in their books, and every one of the members to extract a copy for their own remembrance.

Mr. James Melvine discoursed on the last chapter of Joshua from point to point, with such power and force, that all were forced to fall down before the Lord with sobs and tears, and to search their own ways in private meditation. Thereafter he made open confession in the name of the rest, of unthankfulness, undutifulness, negligence, clodness, hardness of heart, instability, vani-

ty of mind, folly of speech, and conversation fashioned after the world, and finally, trembling and weeping for the misuse of so honorable a calling, and quaking for fear, that such a weight of God's wrath was lying upon them, for the blood of so many souls belonging to their charge, they wept bitterly, and sought grace from God for amendment. After this confession, the moderator proceeded in his discourse, and after diverse other points of doctrine, admonitions and exhortations, delivered for the purpose, every one, by lifting up of the hand testified, before God, mutually, one before the other, the sincere and earnest purpose of their hearts to study to amend, and serve God better in time to come, both in their lives, and in the great office of the ministry, &c. Thereafter, discoursing on these words, *Ye are witnesses against yourselves this day*, &c. he applied them to the present purpose. So with their own consent it was agreed, that a minute and sum of that whole action should be inserted and registered in their books, there to remain for a remembrance, during their time, and for an example to posterity. Thereafter, putting them in remembrance of the defection, made soon after the death of Joshua; for preventing the like, and fastening of this covenant the more firmly in the hearts of all the brethren of younger age, he required some ancient fathers to declare, what they had seen and heard concerning the great work of God, in planting and preserving the gospel, and liberties of Christ's kingdom, with sincerity in this country. David Ferguson, the eldest minister in the company, discoursed, how that a few preachers, viz: only six, whereof himself was one, went forward without fear or care of the world, and prevailed, when there was no name of stipend heard tell of; when authority both ecclesiastical and civil opposed themselves, and there was scarce a man of note or estimation to take the matter in hand. But now the fear and flattery of men, care of purchasing, or fear of losing of money or stipends, had weakened the hearts of a number of ministers; and withal he made an exhortation for the purpose.—Mr. John Davidson subjoined a comparison of the new temple with the old. He was present in the mean time, as sent by the general assembly, together with Mr. Patrick Simpson, to visit that synod. Mr. David Black followed with a powerful exhortation. Mr. Andrew Melvine insisted upon the fear of defection, and put the brethren in remembrance of a late proof of great weakness and backsliding; how many, for fear of want of their stipends only, were brought to a

* *Life of Josephus*, § 52.

sort of denying Christ, by subscribing the acts of parliament, A. D. 1554. What shall be looked for then, said he, if the Spaniards, who have lately taken Calais, should transport themselves in a few hours in our Frith, and essay our constancy with fire and exquisite torments, upon which piece of service our excommunicated and forfaulted earls are attending. In end, he exhorted them to fix this present action and covenant in their memories. David Ferguson taught the second day at the synod; and Mr. David Black the third, framing their doctrine to the present purpose. The moderator ended with earnest prayer to perform the vows they had made.

As for example of presbyteries; upon the penult Thursday of July, the covenant was renewed in the presbytery of St. Andrews, by a very frequent assembly of gentlemen and burgesses, prepared before for the purpose, by the ministers in every parish. The covenants of Ezra and Nehemiah, which they made with the people, after they returned from Babylon, with fasting and prayer, were read distinctly, the doctrine and exhortation, framed conformably to these heads; and after meditation in private, and public prayer and confession, these vows were made by holding up of hands.

1. The exercise of reading the word, prayer, and catechising of their children and families.

2. The resisting of all enemies to religion.

3. The planting of the ministry within their parishes, according to their ability.

4. To take order that there be no vagabond beggars.

5. To keep public conventions better, and to discharge offices, and common duties for the well being of Kirk and country.

The covenant was renewed likewise in parishes.—[*Calderwood's Hist. of Church of Scotland.*]

[From the London Missionary Register.]

FRANCE.

CONTINENTAL SOCIETY.

In reference to the alleged reformation from Popery mentioned at pp. 120, 207, the Rev. Henry Pyt, one of the Society's correspondents thus resolves it into a

NEW PARTY IN THE ROMISH CHURCH.

I am not aware of one Catholic priest having renounced Popery. What gave rise to this fable is, that there has lately appeared a new party in the Romish church: it is an association of priests who call themselves French Catholic, and whose principal end appears to be to oppose Jesuitism and Ultra-

Montanism. They celebrate the Mass in French. They adopt no books as inspired, but those which are recognised as such in our church: excepting these points, they are as much Catholics and Papists as others.

The same correspondent appeals to the disturbances which took place in Paris in the month of February, in proof of the

INFIDEL PRINCIPLES OF THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE.

I fear that many exaggerate much the progress of the gospel, and the good disposition of the people to receive it. Circumstances are, doubtless, incomparably more favorable now than they were six months ago; but the hearts of men are just as hostile to the gospel. The scenes which signalized, at Paris, the last days of the Carnival, have shewn clearly the profound hatred of the people for what they call religion. They were to celebrate Mass, on Monday the 14th, in the Chapel of St. Roch, for the repose of the soul of the Duke de Berri; circumstances obliged them to transfer this ceremony to the Church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois, near the Louvre. The ceremony was hardly ended, when an individual detached himself from the crowd to fasten on the Catafalco, a picture of the Duke de Bourdeaux, and to crown it with everlastings; the crowd perceived it: they very soon gathered together, and assembled before the church—became irritated—and, in a few moments, the church was pillaged. The people went from thence to the Archbishop's palace, and devastated it entirely: the furniture was thrown into the Seine, and his books burnt: happily for him, he was absent. This tumultuous movement did not end there: the people seemed ready to go against the other churches, in order to destroy them; and it would have been done, had not the National Guards hastened to assemble themselves and interpose their force: they were able to subdue this riot, and to save the other churches from entire destruction; but something more was wanting to satisfy the people. The government were obliged to take some little part in this movement; so that, by order of the authorities, the crosses have been thrown down, and the figures of Christ have disappeared from the public places. This is the abridged account of what has passed. Is it not true that this people is openly impious? Remember, that this people which destroys the churches, and this government which throws down crosses and crucifixes, are Catholic, and know no other religion than that against which they conspire. So it is—"Infidelity let loose

on Superstition, and mistaking it for Christianity." This is the present appearance of the scene.

He states, however, in a later letter :

The occurrences that have and are taking place here, prove that the people are strongly prejudiced against every thing that savours of religion ; yet this does not warrant the assertion, that your zeal, your efforts, and your toils, are doomed to be for ever without success. Throw schools amidst this perverse and unbelieving population—draw the children into these schools—work upon them—and, in many cases, you will have the satisfaction to see the parents brought by their children.

Mr. Pyt thus depicts the
ORGANIZED INFIDELITY OF THE SAINT-SIMONIENS.

Popery seems fallen: the churches are deserted; and the priests discredited, and without influence; and, in lieu of it, the most complete indifference and entire unbelief exercise an unrestrained sway. Infidelity is attempting a plan of organization—to form a body, to become an acting power. It is thus that the Saint-Simoniens are now displaying, and not without success, the greatest activity to spread abroad the venom of their infidel principles. They occupy in Paris the largest and the most handsomely fitted halls, and the crowd follow them every where. The most popular of our politico-philosophical newspapers, called "The Globe," edited by the highest literary men, dedicates its columns to the propagation of these monstrous doctrines.

Never was error more visibly stamped with the seal of Satan. Their fundamental principle is this—"Religion is to perfect the social condition of man: therefore christianity is no longer suitable for society; because it sets the Christian apart from other men, and leads him to live for another world. The world requires a religion which should be of this world, and consequently a God of this world." This is the basis of that doctrine, which at the present moment threatens to make large inroads on enlightened society. It is too metaphysical for the common people, but the others seem delighted with it.

The picture is very dark—a people altogether indifferent, carrying the distance at which they stand from all religion, even to hatred—an enlightened state of society framing infidelity into a system, in order to propagate it by every possible means!

He adds, in a subsequent communication:—

The Saint-Simoniens continue to turn to their own profit the disgust of the people for Christianity. These Saint-Simoniens are animated with the deepest hatred against our adorable Saviour: they lose no occasion of blaspheming Him, and their blasphemies are willingly received. I went lately to hear them, accompanied by my wife. Their number was considerable. Four young men presided: one of them read a discourse on a point of political economy; and, though the subject was far removed from christianity, the young orator found occasion to utter some blasphemies against the name of the Saviour. As a Christian and a minister of Christ, I could not be silent; and, as they consent to objections being made, I rose to ask to speak: leave was granted me; and, while my wife assisted me by her prayers, I spoke for the Lord. A lively discussion took place between us, and lasted nearly three-quarters of an hour. I was able to judge of the impiety of the people who were there, by the murmurs of disapprobation which were raised in the auditory when I spoke to them of the love of God in the gift of his Son, and the death of the adorable Saviour. I do not know what was the effect produced by this discussion. These unhappy people think themselves already conquerors; but the Gospel has triumphed over other adversaries besides such as these.

HERESY SPREADING.

The spread of heresy throughout the visible church is truly alarming. The friends of truth will find, in the letter annexed, cause, not only of alarm, but also of deep lamentation. The scriptural doctrine concerning the atonement of our blessed Lord, it seems, is, not only in America, but also in Britain, fast receding before those *soul ruining* views which Socinians and *Socinianizers* have exhibited on that most vitally important subject. Our readers, at least some of them, will recollect to have read in vol. ii. of the MONITOR, a review of "Beman's Sermons on the Atonement," in which, the anti-scriptural, God-dishonoring and blasphemous views, entertained by that author, on the subject, are pointed out and condemned. We knew that these views were widely embraced in this country, but we were not aware that they had been embraced in Britain to the extent asserted in the following letter. Mr. Beman's book, it appears, is very highly prized by his English correspondent, and is read with great avidity by others. It is to be republished there, and *notes* added, even *explanations*, some

things must be *softened* and *smoothed down* a little, "simply because that English Theologians are not *so prepared* to receive such a treatise as the divines of New-England are!" It strikes us, that had Mr. Beman been deposed for his heresy, instead of having been rewarded with the Moderator's chair, by the General Assembly, his book would not have been so likely to poison the church. In that case, the bane, to a certain extent, would have had its antidote. It is hoped however that the orthodox party, in that church, will, in their present laudable struggle for truth, become triumphant and discharge a solemn duty towards such "false brethren" as Beman, Barnes, and all others of the same theological stamp. For we boldly aver that men of such sentiments are unfit for the ministry or communion of Christ's church. Mr. B.'s correspondent enquires respecting "the work of God in the revival of religion" among us. Mr. B. will no doubt inform him that "powerful revivals" are every where enjoyed throughout the country. But would it not be better to tell him the truth, that there is a very great *revival of heresy* in these United States, and that it is to be feared that such a blessing as a revival of true religion is seldom enjoyed? We cannot possibly be persuaded that those revivals are genuine which are produced by means of such doctrines as Mr. Beman has published to the world. The preaching of such doctrines may produce great *excitements*, but we have yet to learn that God blesses *error* to the conversion and salvation of souls. "Sanctify them through thy TRUTH," is the prayer of our great High Priest; and "teach me thy TRUTH," is the ardent desire of every sincere soul. Now when it is considered, that our "modern revivals" flourish best under the ministry of those who are "unsound in the faith," and that they are seldom seen in those congregations (no matter to what denomination they belong) where the truth is faithfully exhibited, what reflecting person can hesitate for a moment to pronounce them *spurious* and *delusive*? But on this subject we refer the reader to the article, commencing the present number, which we trust will be read with interest; and we would here express our desire that the esteemed writer of that article would follow up his proposed plan as vigorously as his attention to other duties will admit.

But we are detaining the reader too long from the "Letter," which we republish merely for the sake of the intelligence which it conveys in regard to the fearful spread of

error. We must add however, that it is with deep regret we learn that Dr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, who has so successfully combatted the Socinians on the subject of our Lord's divinity, should adopt so nearly their views on the great subject of his atonement.

A LETTER TO REV. N. S. S. BEMAN.

Oswestry, Shropshire, June 1st, 1831.

MY DEAR SIR.—You will very likely, be much surprised at receiving a letter from one who is such an utter stranger to you. I have become acquainted with you by means of your discourses on the atonement. The Rev. Mr. Everett of Utica, in your province, sent to one of his friends in Wales a copy of your work. As my own studies have been much directed to a consideration of the doctrine of the atonement, this Welsh Friend lent me your book, which I read with exceeding great pleasure and profit. As I had been led to think that this copy was the only one in this country, I transcribed it with my own hand. I have been frequently asked by some of the most respectable Welsh ministers, and by Mr. Bickerton Williams, the Biographer of Philip and Matthew Henry, to publish a new edition of your work, with notes. Notes are mentioned simply because that English Theologians are not so prepared to receive such a treatise as the divines of New-England are. The Welsh ministers are almost all capital divines and, with the exception of a very few indeed, are advocates of the views of the atonement exhibited in your work. On the contrary the majority of the English ministers embrace the commercial views of atonement, advocated by Dr. Owen, and others; namely: that the atonement consisted according to the language of the schools, in paying the *idem* in the penalty, and not the *tantumdem*. I am now preparing a work which I intend to publish before this year is out, and which I intend to call "The extent of the Atonement in relation to GOD and the Universe." When the work is out, I shall beg your acceptance of a copy as a memento of my high esteem for you personally, and of my obligations to you for your masterly work on the atonement. This copy of your work which my Welsh friend has, has made a tour through all Wales, and is now at this moment taking a circuit among the London Ministers, to whom I hope GOD will eminently bless it.

In England, during the last two years, many works on the atonement have come out, some of them very valuable. The new

edition of Dr. Pye Smith's *Discourses on the sacrifice of Christ, &c.* is a great acquisition to the Theological student. Dr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, has published a new edition of his *Discourses on the Socinian Controversy*, enlarged. In this edition your work is mentioned and recommended. Dr. Wardlaw has also published another work called "*Two Essays on Assurance and on Atonement.*" The Essay on Atonement in its general aspect is very good. I suppose you have seen his work on the Socinian Controversy, and know that he regards the commercial view of the Atonement with great abhorrence. Dr. Dewar of Glasgow, also has published rather a large book on the *Nature, Reality, and Efficacy of the Atonement*. In this work Dr. Dewar keeps to the commercial system, but endeavors to give it as wide a range as he can by the old proposition that the Atonement is sufficient for all but not designed for all. One of the best books published on the subject lately is "*A Treatise on the Atonement by the Rev. C. Jerram,*" a clergyman of the church of England, and a friend of the late Andrew Fuller. At the end of his work is a section on Public Justice. Some of his remarks are very good though he does not steer quite clearly of making Christ endure the identical penalty threatened to the sinner. In Scotland, there have been long and loud discussions on the subject of Universal Pardon which has supplied occasions for many good treatises on the universal aspect of the Gospel Dispensation. It seems to me that the leading error of the Advocates of Universal Pardon is, that they confound God's Reconcilableness to the sinner, with his judicial act of Pardon. But both friends and foes of the doctrine of Universal Pardon write on the supposition that the sinner's penalty like a commercial debt has been paid by Christ. In Wales, the Congregationalists have a Magazine, in their own language, called "*Y. Dysgedydd,*" or "*The Instructor,*" which contains some very good Theological articles, and all harmonizing with your views of the Atonement. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, however, are ultra Calvinists saying that "*now the Christian stands on higher grounds than God.*"

As I see no American Periodicals, you will greatly oblige me by giving me an account of your various Theological writers, and especially of those which embrace your views of the Atonement, with the names of their works. Intelligence also concerning the work of God in the revival of religion among you, will be highly acceptable.—

English churches rejoice in what GOD is doing for America, and, I earnestly pray that the time to favor England may soon come.

I thought of asking you whether you have ever seen Truman's "*Great Propitiation.*" Truman lived in the time of Bishop Bull and had some controversies with him. This treatise on the Atonement is one of the very best ever published, very clear, and very forcible. He seems however to understand the theory of Atonement much better than the application of it, for he is a great stickler for the Remedial Law. The famous Richard Baxter's "*Universal Redemption,*" is the most powerful of his controversial Works, though occasionally disfigured by scholastic niceties. A re-publication of Truman's *Great Propitiation* is a great desideratum.

I make no apology for thus troubling you, because I do unto others as I would have others do unto me; and I shall be very happy to hear from you as early as you can write. Perhaps I ought to tell you a little about myself. I was born at South Wales, studied at Homerton College under Dr. Pye Smith, and am now Pastor of the Congregational church at Oswestry in Shropshire.

I must close with every expression of sincere respect and esteem by subscribing myself.

Your affectionate Brother in Christ,
THOMAS WILLIAM JENKYN.

POPISH INDULGENCE.

The following letter from ROME dated 18th March, 1831, written by the Hon. A. D. Bernard to his friend in Rochester, shows that Popery at Head Quarters is as wicked and blasphemous as ever.

MY DEAR H.—The doctrine of indulgences is in full vogue at Rome. Indulgence, however, does not mean license for future sins—at least it is denied that such license is ever granted. It signifies rather pardon for the past—but this is granted by the quantity. It is not an uncommon inscription over the door of a church—"Plenary indulgence to the living and the dead." This of course means something more than the mere forgiveness of sins in this world—the power of the priest invades the future, so far at least, as to enable him to relieve souls from the pains of purgatory. In the centre of that stupendous pile of ruins—the Colosium—a plain wooden cross has been erected, and occupies of course the arena where rivers of Christian blood have flowed,

at the orders of the persecutors of the church. This cross bears an inscription that the kissing of this wood shall procure to any individual who performs the pious act, "indulgence for two hundred days." Accordingly the place is constantly crowded with hundreds and hundreds of persons who come to kiss away their sins. In one of my rambles a few days since I met with an *Oratore*, inclosing a Madonna in a glass case in a niche of a garden wall; and here the good Catholic was informed that two hundred days indulgence could be obtained by repeating before this altar the Litany entire by the gracions clemency of a Pope who lived in the early part of the fourteenth century. This two hundred days seems to be a favorite period of indulgence, and is used very commonly as a kind of small change for the payment of little debts, as a convenient reward of merit. The present Pope has just announced that indulgence to all persons, now in the schools of the priests and training for holy week, who shall be able, at that time, to repeat the catechism without missing.

It is difficult for a Protestant to understand this doctrine of indulgence perfectly. It is certain that they are favors sought after by the people with great eagerness, and that the power of the priests to grant or withhold them at pleasure, gives them a control over the credulous which is altogether irresistible. As nearly as I can learn, this indulgence, whether granted to the living or the dead, has a direct relation to the pains of purgatory. To the dead, at the prayer of their surviving friends—provided they can pay for it—the indulgence conveys relief, either complete, or for some stipulated portion of the suffering to which the souls have been condemned. In the case of the living, an indulgence for instance, two hundred days, strikes out from the list of sins for which the souls must otherwise suffer in purgatory, all those committed within the said two hundred days—in short the indulgence is a kind of certificate which he carries with him to show to his keepers in the "middle state," on the production of which they are obliged to their great disappointment, no doubt, to abate just so much of his punishment as is specified in the ticket.

According to this doctrine, they must be lucky fellows who happen to live and be present at the time the sacred door of St. Peter's is thrown open. This is the great portal of the northernmost of the three great naves of the church, and is thrown open every quarter of a century, and kept open

for a year. It is now walled up. A grand jubilee takes place on its being opened, and during the year, all Catholics who enter by this door to their devotions at the shrine of the Apostle thereby purchase indulgence for life.

This purgatory seems to have been a necessary invention, after the Pope had appropriated Hell for the exclusive accommodation of heretics. His own subjects would become rebellious and beyond control, if future punishment of some kind had not been contrived for them. In preparing, however, his place of torments, he took care to make it as much like Hell as he could well devise it. Even in duration it must vie with its prototype; for I understand the Pope sometimes grants indulgence—or in other words relief from purgatory—for the moderate period of ten thousand years. It was certainly very benevolent in him, when devising this curious place, to retain the entire control of it in his own hands. The Devil is but a sort of *locum tenens* of this patrimony, which decends regularly to each succeeding Pope as absolute proprietor—and the latter may of course drive the other out if he does not mind his cue, and take possession himself in person.

ABSTINENCE.

In our last number, a communication *On things indifferent, &c.* was inserted, the principal design of which was to prove, that under existing circumstances, *abstinence from the use of ardent spirits was a duty incumbent upon every christian.* The hinge on which the argument turned (and which we firmly believe is all that divine revelation warrants on the subject,) was the sinfulness of giving OFFENCE, or as the Apostle has it, "take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to those that are weak." The writer of that article supposed that the christian's duty in regard to the matter under consideration could be performed by him in his individual capacity as a church member, without giving a public pledge (that he would perform his duty as a christian) to a self-created TEMPERANCE SOCIETY, composed partly of men of the world and partly of church members, and therefore, a *voluntary association*, and in its nature *extraneous* to the church of Jesus Christ; and accordingly he states certain objections against christians uniting with such an institution, inasmuch as they were members, by their solemn religious profession, of a Temperance

Society constituted by the great Head of the church. It may be proper here to observe that the communication referred to is not to be considered as exhibiting the sentiments of the Associate Church relative to temperance societies. Many of her ministers and people are members and advocates of said societies; and it is probable that such will disagree with our correspondent in his *objections*. But we know that there are others again, both ministers and private members, who coincide, in opinion, with him, and who, by virtue of their obligations, as church members, are practising on the principle of entire abstinence.

The following is from the pen of professor Edgar, of the Secession Church, in Ireland. The professor is an advocate of the temperance society. With this exception, we are happy to find that his views and those of our correspondent entirely agree. On the main point, viz: the duty of *totally abstaining* from the use of ardent spirits, under the existing state of things, their reasoning perfectly coincides.

"The gospel is emphatically the 'law of liberty'—the liberty of doing what love makes delightful. It is most consistent with such liberty, to make every sacrifice consistent with health and duty, rather than cast a stumblingblock in the way of a brother. The christian has the highest warrant for the use of animal food; yet he cheerfully foregoes his right, when the exercise of it would hurt the conscience of a brother, excite prejudice against religion, or, by the power of example, induce a brother to sin. 'It is good,' says the unerring oracle, 'neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor *any thing* whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.' The christian is not forbidden the use of wine, as the Nazarite of old; he does not consider the use of wine to be sinful; yet when he finds that his use throws a temptation in his brother's way, and affords an apology for excess; when he finds that intemperate opinions and practices prevail to an alarming extent, and that many stumble, and are offended and made weak, he suits his conduct to existing circumstances: his language is—'*All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; and I will not use, while the world stands, that whereby I make my brother to offend.*'"

The Apostle Paul would have commended his brother Timothy for acting on this good and wholesome rule of christian charity, had not the infirm state of his health required the medicinal virtue of a small por-

tion of wine. He, therefore exhorts him in the spirit of medical prescription, "to use no longer water" as his only drink, according to his former practice, but to use "a *little* wine for his *stomach's* sake, and his *often infirmities.*"

Though, therefore, a certain use of wine is allowed in scripture, yet every man is not only perfectly at liberty to refrain from its use when he pleases, but there are circumstances in which abstinence from it is highly commendable, and consistent with the noblest principles of christianity. There is nothing wrong in abstinence from any particular kind of meat or drink. While an all bountiful God has furnished us with a rich variety of articles of food, he has laid us under no necessity of using each and all of different kinds. Some of them we may choose, others refuse, as our taste or our reason dictates. There is no breach of a divine command, no disrespect shown to the good creatures of God, in making a choice among the different articles of meat or of drink. Every man is exercising such choice freely every day, for the sake of his health or his appetite; and no one counts it wrong. Should either blame, then, or ridicule be attached to him who abstains for the sake of conscience? Has any man a right to compel me to drink wine, or to quote in justification of his tyrannical conduct—"Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused." I have just as good a right not to drink, as another has to drink; and Temperance Societies will deserve the praise of all good men, if in the midst of a host of compulsory customs and courtesies, they should be able to do no more than establish the right of refusing.

In establishing such a right they will be doing no dishonor to him, who, though the creator of the vine, commanded the Nazarites to abstain from all that it produces; and who highly commended the descendants of Rechab, for evidencing, by abstinence from wine, their obedience to the wise injunction of Jonadab their father. No sincere christian can consider abstinence from wine sinful, after having reflected on the language of Christ respecting John the Baptist,—"*among them,*" said he, "*that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John,*" and yet John came "*neither eating bread nor drinking wine.*" To *command* to abstain is anti-christian; to abstain, may be a noble exercise of christian liberty.

We require not to be told, then, of the allusions made in scripture to the use of wine.

We know them; but we know too, that the usual beverage of the Jews was water, and that the Jews were deservedly considered a temperate people. No member of a temperance society asserts that it is sinful to drink wine—he has no desire either to affix a stigma to its temperate use, or to forbid it; all that he contends for is, that what is perfectly lawful may, under peculiar circumstances, become inexpedient: in the midst of unbounded intemperance, he is anxious to draw between his own practice, and that of the multitude, a clearly defined line of separation; and being most desirous not only to shun all appearance of evil, but to mark in the strongest manner, his abhorrence of intemperance in all its stages, he evidences, by his abstinence from distilled spirits, his conviction, that the state of society has been grievously vitiated; and he withdraws himself from all connexion with those opinions and practices by which, in the present depraved state of society, the use of intoxicating liquor is made essential to health and social intercourse, and from which, as the most prolific of all sources, springs the overwhelming drunkenness of our day.

Such a course of conduct would be most justifiable and proper under certain circumstances, even with respect to the wine spoken of in scripture. It may be laid down as a general position, that all vinous countries are temperate. France, with all its infidelity, sets us a noble example of temperance. But suppose that in such a country as France, wine should be so horribly abused as to become a bane and curse, then the truly christian spirit would call for extraordinary exigencies; and to avoid every apology for excess, as well as to stamp evil practices, with the strongest reprobation, would abstain from that which caused stumbling, and offence, and weakness. The mere circumstance of the article abused being a good creature of God, would present no objection to such a course of conduct, for the use of an article good in itself may become wholly inexpedient to an enlightened conscientious mind. The meat offered in sacrifice to idols was not changed in its nature by being presented to that which, as a mere creature of imagination, “is nothing in the world;” it did not cease from being a good creature of God; and yet the primitive christians did not hesitate to recommend abstinence from it. It would be easy to find similar illustrations in a multitude of cases, where the wise and conscientious abstain from things indifferent, solely on account of the evil effects which would arise from an inexpedient

use of christian liberty. It is thus evident that scripture furnishes temperance societies with much higher ground than they occupy, for while they only recommend abstinence from distilled spirits, they have the fullest warrant to abstain even from wine. If the spirit of christian charity induced the Apostle Paul and many of the primitive christians to abstain even from wine, what shall be thought of the hardihood that asserts it to be *wrong* to abstain from distilled spirits?

[For the Religious Monitor.]

QUERIES.

I. In Ezek. xxxiii. 11. it is said “I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.”—And 1 Tim. ii. 4 “Who will have all men to be saved.”

Query: What then is the reason that all are not saved?

II. In Eccel. xii. 10. Solomon says he “sought out acceptable words.” Paul says, 1 Cor. ii. 13. “We speak not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.”

Query: Is there no discrepancy here?—Are the words of scripture, as well as the matter inspired? If so, what does Solomon mean?

III. It is said, Prov. xxii. 6. “Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.”

Query: What then is the reason, why so many children of godly parents are dissolute and profligate?

Any of your correspondents, Mr. Editor, who will publish a solution to these Queries, will confer a favor on the Querist.

OMICRON.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

CHRIST THE SON OF GOD.

MR. EDITOR—The passage John, x. 34, 36. has been much employed by the advocates of *official sonship* in support of their sentiments. I confess it is a passage, with which I have had considerable difficulty—Having recently met with a view of it, to me very satisfactory, and judging that it might be satisfactory also to others, interested in the subject, I transcribe it for insertion in the MONITOR, if you think proper. It is taken from the Christian Spectator, Vol. ii. 460. The writer, after giving various views entertained of the passage, goes on to say, “If the kings and rulers in Israel are by the Spirit of inspiration called gods, because they typified the great Messiah—

because they prefigured and predicted the King of Zion, then Messiah must be truly God; for the scriptures cannot be broken—the type must have its antitype; and the antitype of those who were typical gods, must be truly God. Therefore it is highly absurd for you Jews, to say of him, whom the Father hath consecrated Messiah,—whom he hath distinguished from all others—made pre-eminently above them, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because he said, *I am the Son of God.*”* D.

P. S. Permit me through the medium of the Monitor, to express my grateful esteem of the many valuable papers on Christ's Divinity, which have for some time, and continue still to enrich the pages of the Monitor. The importance of the subject is excelled by none; the discussion is necessary, and executed in a manner, that cannot fail to be highly interesting to all readers, who believe that, on the divinity of the Lord Jesus, depends the salvation of immortal souls.

D.

[From the Critica Biblica.]

BIBLICAL CRITICISMS ADD ILLUSTRATIONS.

Mark, chap. ix. v. 49.

Πας γαρ πυρι ἀλισθησεται, και πασα θυσια ἁλι ἀλισθησεται.

For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.

This sentence connects with the foregoing; as the particle γαρ, *for*, which is causal, shews. In the preceding verse we read, that offenders shall be cast into the Gehenna of fire; where the fire shall perpetually burn them, and the consciousness of their crimes shall perpetually torment them. For every one, that is, πας ὁ εἰς τὴν γέεναν τοῦ πυρὸς βληθεὶς, ἀλισθησεται, for every one, who is cast into the Gehenna of fire, shall be *seasoned*, shall be *preserved* in this fire. This fire shall act upon the wicked, who are thrown into it, as brine acts upon the meat, over which it is poured. It shall consolidate, not consume them. Unlike all other fires, it shall not destroy life, but prolong it. Such is the state of every incorrigible offender. It remains to be shown, what is the portion reserved for the faithful. Every faithful disciple, who is so truly devoted to the christian cause, as to be ready to die in its defence, is here represented under the figure of a sacrifice, *seasoned with salt*.—Πασα θυσια, every sacrifice, saith Christ, thus prepared for, and devoted to me, shall

* Lampe in his commentary on John has given the same view of this passage.—Ed. Rel. Mon.

be considered as seasoned with salt. The Jews were taught to understand that sacrifices, thus seasoned, were *acceptable* to the Lord. Every sincere disciple is here, by anticipation and prolepsis, denominated θυσια, a *sacrifice*. By this appellation he was forwarned of an event, which the sword of persecution would not fail to accomplish.—With a like view to *sacrifices*, St. Paul thus writes to the Philippians: εἰ και σπενδομαι *if I be poured out*; and to Timothy: ἐγω γαρ ἤδη σπενδομαι, *for I am now ready to be poured out*.

Thus the punishment, hereafter to be inflicted on the wicked, and the recompence reserved for the faithful, are expressed in terms, fetched from those sacrificial rites with which the Jews were conversant. Commentators, conceiving the sense to be, *consumed* by fire, have proposed to read instead of ἀλισθησεται, *shall be salted*, ἀναλωθησεται, *shall be destroyed*. But the very reverse of *consumed* is the sense intended. A learned critic has indeed said, that “as to salting with fire, nothing can be made of it.” Much, and much more to the purpose, may be made of it, than can be made of any word, which criticism, in its ardor to amend, may have undertaken to substitute. Salt is good; but if the salt ἀνάλον γενηται, should have become insipid, ἐν τινι αὐτο ἀρτυσεται, *quo condimento salem ipsam condietis*.

ISAIAH, xxxv. 7.

And the glowing sands shall become a pool,
And the thirsty soil bubbling springs.

BISHOP LOWTH'S TRANSLATION.

The word (*Serab*) is Arabic, as well as Hebrew, expressing in both languages the same thing; the glowing sandy plain, which in hot countries, at a distance, has the appearance of water. It occurs in the Koran, (chap. xxiv.) ‘But as to the unbelievers, their works are like a vapour in a plain, which the thirsty traveller thinks to be water, until, when he cometh thereto, he findeth it to be nothing.’ Mr. Sale’s note on this place is, ‘The Arabic word serab signifies that false appearance, which in the eastern countries is often seen in sandy plains, about noon, resembling a large lake of water in motion, and is occasioned by the reverberation of the sun-beams: (by the quivering undulating motion of that quick succession of vapours and exhalations, which are extracted by the powerful influence of the sun. Shaw’s Travels, p. 378.) It sometimes tempts thirsty travellers out of their way, but deceives them, when they

come near, either going forward (for it always appears at the same distance,) or quite vanishes." Thus Bishop Lowth (where see more) in loco, to which we subjoin the following lively picture of this phenomenon from the pen of the intrepid traveller, Belzoni. "The next phenomenon is *mirage*, often described by travellers, who assert having been deceived by it, as at a distance it appears to them like water. This certainly is the fact, and I must confess, that I have been deceived myself, even after I was aware of it. The perfect resemblance to water, and the strong desire for this element, made me conclude, in spite of all my caution not to be deceived, that it was really water I saw. It generally appears like a still lake, so unmoved by the wind, that every thing above is to be seen most distinctly reflected by it, which is the principal cause of deception. If the wind agitate any of the plants that rise above the horizon of the mirage, the motion is seen perfectly at a great distance. If the traveller stand elevated much above the mirage, the apparent water seems less united and less deep, for, as the eyes look down upon it, there is not thickness enough in the vapour on the surface of the ground to conceal the earth from the sight. But, if the traveller be on a level with the horizon of the mirage, he cannot see through it, so that it appears to him clear water. By putting my head first to the ground, and then mounting a camel, the height of which from the ground might have been about ten feet at the most, I found a great difference in the appearance of the mirage. On approaching it, it becomes thinner, and appears as if agitated by the wind, like a field of ripe corn. It gradually vanishes as the traveller approaches, and at last entirely disappears when he is on the spot."*

It is probable that Jeremiah refers to the serab or mirage, when, in pouring forth his complaint to God for mercies deferred, he says, "Wilt thou be altogether unto me as *waters that be not seen*," (Jer. xv. 18. margin) that is, *which have no reality*, as the Septuagint has rendered it.† The following observations on the horrors of travelling in the Great Desert of Arabia, from the same pen as the above, will afford an admirable illustration of the passage. After

describing the appearance of the Desert from the intense heat of the sun, &c. Mr. Belzoni proceeds: "Generally speaking, in a desert, there are few springs of water, some of them at the distance of four, six and eight days journey from one another, and not all of sweet water: on the contrary, it is generally salt or bitter; so that, if the thirsty traveller drinks of it, it increases his thirst, and he suffers more than before. But when the calamity happens, that the next well, which is so anxiously sought for, is found dry, the misery of such a situation cannot well be described. The camels, which afford the only means of escape, are so thirsty that they cannot proceed to another well: and, if the travellers kill them, to extract the little liquid which remains in their stomachs, they themselves cannot advance any further. The situation must be dreadful, and admits of no resource. Many perish, *victims of the most horrible thirst*. It is then that the value of a cup of water is really felt. He that has a *zenzabia* of it, is the richest of all. In such a case there is no distinction. If the master has none, the servant will not give it to him; for very few are the instances, where a man will voluntarily lose his life to save that of another, particularly in a caravan in the desert, where people are strangers to each other. *What a situation for a man, though a rich one, perhaps the owner of all the caravans! He is dying for a cup of water—no one gives it to him—he offers all he possesses—no one hears him—they are all dying—though by walking a few hours farther they might be saved.—If the camels are lying down, and cannot be made to rise—no one has strength to walk—only he that has a glass of that precious liquor lives to walk a mile farther, and perhaps dies too. If the voyages on seas are dangerous, so are those in the deserts. At sea, the provisions very often fail; in the desert it is worse; at sea storms are met with; in the desert there cannot be a greater storm than to find a dry well;—at sea one meets with pirates—we escape—we surrender—we die; in the desert they rob the traveller of all his property and water; they let him live perhaps, but what a life! to die the most barbarous and agonizing death. In short, to be thirsty in a desert without water, exposed to the burning sun without shelter, and *no hopes* of finding either, is the most terrible situation that a man can be placed in, and one of the greatest sufferings that a human being can sustain: the eyes grow inflamed; the tongue and lips swell; a hollow sound is*

* Narrative of Operations and Researches in Egypt, &c. p. 196. 4to. or vol. i. pp. 304, 305.—Sir R. K. Porter also bears witness to the complete deception of these vapours. Travels in Armenia, &c. vol. ii. pp. 241, 242.

† ὕδωρ ἄφωτος οὐκ ὄψιν πιδόν.

heard in the ears, which brings on deafness, and the brains appear to grow thick and inflamed:—all these feelings arise from the want of a little water. In the midst of all this misery the deceitful mirages appear before the traveller at no great distance, *something like a lake or river of clear fresh water*. If perchance a traveller is not undeceived, he hastens his pace to reach it sooner; the more he advances towards it, the more it goes from him, till at last it vanishes entirely, and the deluded passenger often asks, where is the water he saw at no great distance? He can scarcely believe that he was so deceived; he protests that he saw the waves running before the wind, and the reflection of the high rocks in the water.”*

MATTHEW, iii. 4.

And his meat was locusts and wild honey.

Some commentators are of opinion that the food of John, in the wilderness, was not the real locusts, but the bud of the locust-tree, a shrub common in Judæa; there is, however, little doubt but this assertion is incorrect, as the insect was not only ceremonially clean by the Mosaic law (Lev. xi. 22.) but has been used as an article of food, from the most remote antiquity. Some of the Ethiopian tribes from this circumstance received the appellation of *Acridophagi*, (locust-eaters,) and Pliny relates, that they were in high esteem among the Parthians. According to Niebuhr, in Arabia they are caught and put into bags, or on strings to dry. The Bedouins of Egypt roast them alive, and devour them with avidity. In Barbary they are boiled, and then dried on the roofs of the houses: Jackson, during a short stay there, in 1799, saw dishes of them served up at the principal tables, and adds that they were considered a great delicacy. Hasselquist was informed, that at Mecca, when there was a scarcity of corn, they ground locusts as a substitute in their hand-mills, or pounded them in a stone mortar, and that they mixed this flower with water into a dough with which they made their cakes. He likewise says, that they frequently eat them in time of plenty, but then they boil them first, and afterwards stew them in butter. Bochart informs us, that waggon loads of these insects are brought to Fez, as an usual article of food. The ancient Africans used to smoke or salt, and

then fry them; and when thus prepared, according to Dr. D. Clark, their taste resembles that of a river cray-fish. Dr. Shaw was in company with some French emigrants who assured him that they were not only very palatable but wholesome.

It is probable that John either ate locusts fried with honey, or, when there was a scarcity of locusts, subsisted on honey alone, with which the rocks and trees of Judæa abounded, (Deut. xxii. 13, and 1 Sam. xiv. 26.) Honey and butter were a common fare (Isa. vii. 15.) and D'Arvieux while on a visit to the Grand Emir's camp in Arabia, often partook of this mixture, and says that it is not disagreeable even to a novice in the Eastern mode of living.

GOD SAVE THE KING!

This celebrated phrase occurs in the following scripture passages: 1 Sam. x. 24.; 2 Sam. xvi. 16.; 2 Kings xi. 12.; and 2 Chron. xxiii. 11., as read in the common English translation; and this use of it is said* to have originated our peculiar exclamation of loyalty. Peculiar it may well be termed; for by what other people has the Divine name been thus introduced and profaned? Besides, where is the necessity for it, when there is no foundation for it in the sacred original, and the sentiment can be fully expressed without any approach towards violating the well known precept of the Decalogue? The Hebrew words of the above texts are correctly translated in Greek, Ζητω ὁ βασιλεως; in Latin, *Vivat rex!* in French, by the familiar phrase, *Vive le roi!* in Welch, by *wyddlo'r brenhin!* and which in English might be, *Long live the King!* or *The King forever!*

Whether this national acclamation arose from its use in the English Bible? or whether the translators employed it in accommodation to general custom? must be ascertained from historical evidence. The anthem, bearing this name, is stated to have been “written on the escape of king James I. from the gunpowder plot, on the fifth of November, 1605.”† Was this exclamatory phrase in use before that period? Or does it occur in any editions of an English Bible, anterior to that date?‡

* By the writer on Acclamation, in the *Encyclo. Metropol. Div. ic.* p. 72.

† The *Philanthrop. Gazette*, for June 28, 1820. p. 200.

‡ The Bishop's Bible of 1583 has “God save the King,” in each passage. EDIT.

* Narrative, &c. pp. 341—343, 4to, or vol. ii. pp. 90—93. 8vo.

c-
n-
w
ts
ly

ts
a
e,
ea
v.
re
a
a,
at
he

ol-
t;
2
on
is
la-
be
he
ro-
for
ca-
lly
no-
ca-
ve
ro
ch,
in
ch
he

se
th-
no-
er-
un-
ve
nes
of
ma-
Or
ish

clo.

320.

the

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

Wm. Stevenson, Jun., Cambridge, Washington
Co. N. Y.
James M'Lelland, New-York City.
George M'Queen, Esq. Schenectady.
A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.
Wm. Dickey, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Wm. M. Goodwillie, Barnet, Vt.
Rev. A. Whyte, Jr., Baltimore, Md.
Andrew Munro, Cannonsburgh, Pa.
John M'Cleary, York, Livingston Co. N. Y.
Philip Watts, Shelbyville, Ky.
James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio.

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

Agents or others may enclose money to us at our risk, and at our expense where more than \$5 is enclosed.

A number of extra copies of volume eight are being printed under the expectation that they will be called for.

TERMS \$2 00 per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

* * All letters relating to the Monitor, whether they contain communications for our pages, or names of subscribers, or remittances of money, should be addressed to B. D. PACKARD & Co. or to CHAUNCEY WEBSTER, 71 State-street, Albany.

JUST PUBLISHED,

PREDESTINATION Calmly Considered from Principles of Reason, in consistency with the nature of things, and the Scriptures of Truth, in a series of letters to a friend. Also, Answers to Seven Queries on Predestination, by W. C. Tucker.

To which is appended the article on Divine Sovereignty, in volume 2, of the use of Sacred History, by James Jamieson, D. D. 252 pages large 18mo. Price 50 cts.

Copies of this invaluable book have been forwarded for sale to Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.; Rev. J. Beveridge, Philadelphia; Mr. John Duncan, 407 Broadway, New-York; Mr. Wm. Stevenson, Cambridge, N. Y.; Rev. Peter Campbell, Florida, N. Y.; Rev. J. G. Smart, Johnstown, N. Y.; and the Rev. John Russell, Queenston, Upper Canada. Should any of the ministers of the Associate Church in the Western and Southern States desire copies of this book for circulation in their neighborhood, they will be sent to them on commission.

TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

The undersigned, having been requested to express their sentiments respecting the two treatises contained in this little volume, take pleasure in recommending them to all those who desire to *know* and *walk* in the truth, on the important subjects, of which they treat. Although there are other excellent treatises on these subjects which are occasionally to be found in the market; yet the present prevailing indifference to divine truth, especially on these all important points, the consequent abounding of Pelagian and Arminian errors in our country, seem to demand some defence of the Scripture views of these doctrines, at this time. In these two treatises, which are well calculated to accompany each other, the subjects discussed, viz. Predestination and Divine Sovereignty are set forth in a plain, able, and Scriptural manner. They have been both generally and justly esteemed by the friends of truth on the other side the Atlantic, and we can cordially recommend them to the christian public in our own country as eminently seasonable at the present time. They are here presented in a very cheap and convenient form and well adapted to a general circulation.

ALEXANDER BULLIONS, D. D.,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Cambridge, N. Y.

JAMES P. MILLER,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Argyle, N. Y.

JAMES MARTIN,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Albany, N. Y.

Cambridge, July 25th, 1831.

For sale by B. D. PACKARD & Co., No. 71 State-street.